

ORGANIZATION FOR WORLD PEACE:

PIONEER PHASE, 1815-56/61


by

Earl Fee Cruickshank

A.B., University of Kansas, 1924

Submitted to the Department of
History and the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the Univer-
sity of Kansas in partial ful-
fillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts.

Approved by:



Instructor in Charge



Head of Department

May 28, 1927

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	2
Chapter I. Pioneer Organization and Expansion, 1814-43...	6
I. Organization of Peace Societies:	
A. In the United States.....	6
1. New York Peace Society	6
2. Ohio Peace Society	9
3. Massachusetts Peace Society	10
4. Others: North Carolina, Indiana, Maine, Con- necticut, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Penn- sylvania, Georgia	12
5. The AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY	13
B. In Great Britain, Ireland, and possessions	16
1. Early British Peace Sentiment	16
2. LONDON PEACE SOCIETY	17
3. Others: Scotland, Ireland, Nova Scotia, Canada	21
C. In France	22
1. The SOCIETY OF CHRISTIAN MORALS	22
2. Difference in character from those in Great Britain and United States	23
3. Peace Committee within the Society	24
4. Work of English Agents in France: Prize es- says	24
D. In Switzerland	25
1. Geneva Peace Society	25
II. Early Activity of Peace Societies:	
A. American Peace Societies	26
1. Publications and propaganda	27
2. Formation of Auxiliary Societies	28
3. Attitude toward Privateering	29
4. Correspondence with Alexander I	30
5. Prize essays	30
6. Ladd's Plan	31
7. Jay's Proposal	34
B. London Peace Society	35
1. Publications and Propaganda	35
2. Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle	38
3. Chinese War	39

C. The Leaders	39
1. American	39
a. David Low Dodge	39
b. Noah Worcester	41
c. William Ellery Channing	41
d. William Jay	42
e. William Ladd	43
2. British	47
a. Jonathan Dymond	47
b. Thomas Clarkson	47
c. William Allen	48

Chapter II. Character, Leadership and Origin of Peace Congresses

I. General Character of the Peace Congress Movement .. 50

II. Leadership

A. The Great Triumvirate:

1. Joseph Sturge	51
2. Henry Richard	54
3. Elihu Burritt	56

B. Others of Prominence:

1. John Bright	60
2. Richard Cobden	63
3. Charles Sumner	66
4. Amasa Walker	70
5. Others	70

C. Origin of Congress Movement

1. Precedents	72
2. Sturge's efforts	72
3. Action of London Peace Society	74
4. Rigaud's Continental tour	77

Chapter III. The Peace Congresses, 1843-51

I. The London Convention, 1843

A. Proceedings	79
B. Press Comment	84
C. Aftermath	85
D. Significance	86
E. Why no immediate successor?	87

	Page
II. The Brussels Congress, 1848	87
A. Genesis	88
B. Proceedings	90
C. Press Comment	99
D. Significance	100
E. Aftermath	101
III. The Paris Congress, 1849	102
A. Genesis	102
B. Proceedings	106
C. Significance	116
D. Press Comment	117
E. Aftermath	118
IV. The Frankfort-on-the-Main Congress, 1850	119
A. Genesis	119
B. Proceedings	121
C. Significance	128
D. Press Comment	128
E. Aftermath	129
V. The London Congress, 1851	132
A. Genesis	132
B. Proceedings	133
C. Significance...Why no Congress in 1852?	140
D. Press Comment	140
Chapter IV. Failures and Achievements	
I. In America	143
A. State Legislative Action	143
B. National Legislative Action	145
1. Legaré's First Report, 1838	145
2. Legaré's Second Report, 1839	146
3. Cobb's Report, 1846	146
4. Tuck's Report, 1849	146
5. Foote's Resolution, 1851	147
6. Underwood's Report and Resolution, 1853	150
C. Treaty Action (Arbitration)	151
1. Early American participation in arbitration	151
2. Guadalupe-Hidalgo, 1848	152
3. Claims Treaty, 1853	158
4. Fisheries Treaty, 1854	159
D. Free Soil Party Platform, 1852	159

	Page
II. In Great Britain	160
A. Cobden's Arbitration Revolution	160
1. Preparation	161
2. Presentation	163
B. Cobden's Opposition to War Loans	167
III. In Germany and France	168
A. Ruge's Motion in German Diet	168
B. Bouvet's Motion in French National Assembly	168
IV. Schleswig-Holstein Mission	170
A. The Situation	170
B. Invitation	172
C. Undertaking	173
D. Reason for Failure	178
V. Protocol Number 23, Congress of Paris, 1856	180
A. Crimean War and Congress of Paris	180
B. Deputation to Palmerston: Discouragement	182
C. Deputation to Clarendon at Paris	184
D. Memorials to plenipotentiaries	184
E. The Protocol and its Significance	185
Chapter V. The Rise and Triumph of the War Spirit	193
I. First Invasion Panic, 1848	194
A. Causes	194
1. French attitude toward England	195
2. Agitation of Wellington, Palmerston and others	196
3. Publication of Wellington's Letter	197
B. Lord John Russell's Militia Bill	198
1. Peace Society Opposition	198
C. Collapse of Panic: Reasons and Results	199
II. Second Invasion Panic, 1851-2	203
A. Causes	203
B. Lord John Russell's Second Militia Bill	203
C. Passage of Derby Militia Bill	203
1. Opposition by Peace Party	204
2. Prosecutions	204

	Page
D. Death of Duke of Wellington	209
E. Establishment of Second French Empire	210
F. Peace Society Efforts to Avert War	210
1. Cobden's Pamphlet	210
2. Manchester Conference, 1853	211
3. League of Universal Brotherhood efforts	214
4. Other Activities of Peace Society	214
G. Collapse of Panic: Reasons and Results	216
III. Crimean War, 1854-56	216
A. The Eastern Question	217
B. Edinburgh Conference, 1853	218
C. Sturge's Russian Mission	221
D. England drifting into War	222
1. Antagonists	222
2. Protagonists	224
E. Work of Peace Men during War	224
F. Clerical attitude toward War	227
G. Effect of War on Peace Movement in England	227
IV. Later Bellicose Influences	229
A. Invasion Panic of 1859	229
1. Causes	229
2. Results: Cobden's Commercial Treaty	230
B. British Colonial and Imperialistic Wars	230
C. Nationalistic Wars on Continent and in America	230
V. Effect of Civil War upon Peace Movement in America	230
VI. General Causes of Decline of Peace Movement	233
Chapter VI. Summary and Conclusions	236
I. Why the Study?	236
II. The Peace Movement	236
A. Era of Pioneer Organization and Expansion	236
B. Era of Peace Congress Movement	237
C. Resultants	238
D. Reaction	241
E. Revival	242

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author desires to express his grateful appreciation to the libraries of the American Peace Society, the World Peace Foundation, Yale University, Chicago University, and Friends University for the loan and use of books, making possible this study. He wishes especially to recognize numerous generous aids rendered by Mrs. Mable Call, Librarian of the American Peace Society, and above all, the work of Professor Frank E. Melvin, who, as director of this study, has been of inestimable assistance.

INTRODUCTION:

"Every poison carries its own antidote" is a proverb of general currency, but its application to the origin of the first societies organized for the sole avowed purpose of securing general and lasting peace is especially pertinent. The year 1815 witnessed the close of a series of sanguinary wars which had violently shaken and devastated Europe for almost a quarter of a century, and found a tax burdened world revolting against war. Even the United States of America, separated from the general war zone of the Atlantic Ocean, was drawn into the conflict after having suffered the ruin of her commerce, and before making peace with England in 1814, had had a slight experience with the grimness of war. In some countries, notably England, never before had the sentiment for peace been so pronounced.

It is not surprising, therefore, that at such a time men's thoughts should turn towards plans for securing a stablised regime of peace. The idealistic spirit of the era lent itself to the appearance of new schemes for a perfect world order, and revived interest in old ones of the past. Among the new productions appearing during the war were the liberal schemes of Kant's for perpetual peace, Krause's project, so like the present League of Nations, and another by Saint Simon. Similar plans of Henry IV, Abbe de Saint Pierre, William Penn, and others were read

with interest.

On the other hand, the practical statesmen of the past also had tried various schemes to gain the same end. The Balance-of-Power System conceived in the 16th Century and developed into a regular system in the Seventeenth Century, was shown in the Eighteenth Century to be not only irrational but vicious. Therefore in order to stabilize peace, the practical statesmen and diplomatists of Europe created the new Concert-of-Powers system to replace the old Power-Balance system which had been proved by recent events to be so woefully inadequate in meeting the needs of modern society. A project directed toward the same end was the so-called Holy Alliance, sponsored by Alexander I, Tsar of Russia.

Certain economic factors were operating at the same time to arouse a demand for peace. By 1815, the so-called Industrial Revolution in England had been under way for a full half-century, and had even made considerable headway in France. Its social effect was to increase greatly the proletariat and bourgeoisie classes, whose material interests required peace. A by-product of the Industrial Revolution in France was socialism, which, under the leadership of men like Saint Simon and Fourier, was distinctly pacifistic, representing as it did the interests of the proletariat. With the remarkable increase in commerce, and the improvements in transportation and communication which were coming

during the first half of the Nineteenth Century, the world was being bound closely and surely together, without regard for political boundaries. Perhaps the best illustration of the unifying power of economic forces which history affords is seen in the case of the Zollverein in Germany, which, during the first half of the last century, unified Germany economically, and laid a sure basis for the political unification which followed soon afterward. With the development of increased interdependence of nations, war was particularly ruinous.

The Eighteenth Century had experienced a recrudescence of religious and humanitarian zeal on the part of individuals and private and sectarian groups who had found much to attack in a society abounding in anachronisms and defects, and their efforts had been well rewarded. That their successes were an urge in the undertaking of still greater reforms is evident from the following excerpt from a memorial drafted by William Ellery Channing for the Massachusetts Peace Society, and presented to the Congress of the United States about the year 1820:

"..... It is our happiness, that we live in an age when many noble schemes of benevolence have been accomplished; when the idea of a great amelioration of human affairs is no longer rejected as a dream of fancy; when statesmen are beginning to learn that all nations have a common interest; when philanthropy is extending its views to distant countries, and is executing purposes which would once have been regarded as the offspring of a blind and extravagant zeal. In this age of enlarged views, of generous excitement,

of unparalleled activity for the good of mankind, it is hoped that the idea of a nation espousing the cause of peace and humanity, will not be dismissed as visionary and impracticable. Enlightened and benevolent statesmen will discern that we do not live in ordinary times, but that a new and powerful impulse has been given to the human mind, which, under judicious influences, may issue in great and permanent improvements of the social state."

"Thus, encouraged by their past successes, this group of religious and humanitarian spirits, particularly active in Great Britain and the United States, stirred by abhorrence for war which was at variance with their religious principles, set out to do battle with the monstrous custom of war. What practical statesmen had failed to accomplish they would effect by an appeal to the better nature of mankind.

CHAPTER I

PIONEER ORGANIZATION AND EXPANSION

The world's first three peace societies arose in the United States in the same year, 1815, and it would seem independent of each other. Credit for the founding of the first peace society belongs to David Low Dodge, a philanthropist and merchant of the City of New York, and by church affiliation a Presbyterian⁽¹⁾. Mr. Dodge's interest in war was aroused indirectly by a personal experience which occurred ten years before the founding of his society. The profound shock resulting from the narrow escape of his landlord from being shot when he entered Mr. Dodge's sleeping room, led the latter to serious reflection on the matter of carrying arms and to an examination of the scriptures⁽²⁾. He at length became convinced that violence, the use of weapons and war were all inconsistent with Christian principles. Further studies familiarized him with the attitude of the early Christians, Luther, Erasmus, the Moravians and the Quakers toward war, and strengthened his own convictions.

As a result of his study of war, in 1809 he published an essay, "The Mediator's Kingdom not of this World; but Spiritual"⁽³⁾, one thousand copies of which were sold within a week⁽⁴⁾. Within the next few years it went through four editions and had a circulation of twenty thousand copies⁽⁵⁾. As the title suggests, the tract is theological in spirit,

making the point that the Kingdom of the World is of the Devil, as is also war. It presents a thorough religious arraignment of war with many scriptural passages to substantiate the author's position. This tract called forth sarcastic criticism from three literary men in a pamphlet entitled, "The Duty of a Christian Man in a Trying Situation"⁽⁶⁾. To this Mr. Dodge immediately replied. Some sympathetic friends of Mr. Dodge felt that his original tract had been written too unguardedly and without sufficient exactness in definitions, and he devoted himself to more careful study, meanwhile converting about twenty of his friends⁽⁸⁾ to his views. As early as 1810, the group met to consider⁽⁹⁾ the question of forming a peace society for the purpose of diffusing their principles among churchmen. They expressed⁽¹⁰⁾ their intention of avoiding political questions, but because war with Great Britain was brewing, they decided to postpone action, fearing their motives would be misconstrued.⁽¹⁰⁾ Mr. Dodge, however, was appointed to write an essay on war. The fact that his business firm was suffering financial reverses due to the war probably was an influence in his condemnation of it as inhuman, unwise, and criminal, in his second⁽¹⁰⁾ paper, "War Inconsistent with the Christian Religion", which⁽¹¹⁾ appeared early in 1815. This tract, like its predecessor is⁽¹²⁾ theological and is not of outstanding literary merit, but it is marked by "force of thought, a moral earnestness, a persevering logic, a common sense, a hatred of inhumanity, a⁽¹³⁾ passion for justice"⁽¹⁴⁾. On August 16, 1815, after two or three meetings had been held on the subject, the first peace socie-

ty was organized in New York City with from thirty to forty
 (15) members, founded on the principle that all war is unchris-
 (16) tian, and open to men of all sects. Mr. Dodge was unanimous-
 (17) ly elected the first president, and at the first monthly meet-
 ing read an address, "The Kingdom of Peace Under the Benign
 Reign of Messiah", one thousand copies of which were circu-
 (18) lated.

Of vastly greater significance than any of Mr. Dodge's
 tracts, was the brief pamphlet, "A Solemn Review of the Cus-
 (19) tom of War", which was published at Boston, Christmas Day,
 1814, under the pseudonym "Philo Pacificus". It was the work
 of Rev. Noah Worcester, D. D. This was from the first widely
 read in both the United States and Europe, the Peace Socie-
 ties on both sides of the Atlantic using it as a leading pro-
 pagandist tract. In a letter to Thomas Jefferson under date
 of October 18, 1815, Noah Worcester explains his motive in
 (20) writing the tract, as follows: "Near the close of the late
 war I was somehow excited to examine the subject of war in
 general, and I became fully convinced that the custom of
 settling national disputes by war is perfectly needless,
 unjust, and inhuman, as well as anti-Christian, and that
 (21) the custom is supported by delusion and barbaric fanaticism!"

In Worcester's tract the custom of war met with thorough
 examination and denunciation. The author is not merely des-
 tructive in his criticism, however, for he also attempts to
 show how the state of society might be changed. Some of his
 significant statements follow:

"Cannot peace societies be extended through Christendom to support its government and secure the nation from war?.... Let every land be filled with newspapers, tracts, and periodical works adapted to the same purpose...." (22)

again,

"If war is ever to be set aside an effort must sometime be made, and why not now as well as at any future day?...." (23)

also,

"Can Christians hold their peace while this custom is sweeping off myriads of their brethren into eternity by violence and murder?...." (24)

then he asks how it can be ended except by enlightening the
(24)
minds of men on the subject. His closing words are,

"....for war is, in fact, a heathenish and savage custom, most malignant, most desolating and most horrible, and the grossest delusion, the greatest curse, that ever afflicted a guilty world". (25)

Here, then, is a carefully reasoned analysis of war arriving at the conclusion that it should be destroyed, and with specific suggestions for the immediate organization of peace societies. This treatise was the direct occasion for the formation of the second and third societies.

On December 2, 1815, a "Society for Promoting Peace" was established in Warren County, Ohio. A letter to the Massachusetts Peace Society, established later in the same month, runs, "Having seen the 'Solemn Review of the Custom of War',....a number of the citizens of Warren County of different denominations as to religion formed themselves into a society....without having any knowledge at that time
(26)
that any similar society existed on earth."

The Ohio society continued to exist independently until the formation of the American Peace Society in 1828. During its first year or so it published 3,000 copies of several numbers of the "Friend of Peace", a periodical edited by Noah Worcester in Massachusetts. It soon divided into four branch societies, with a total membership of about one hundred, "including respectable clergymen and statesmen". In March of 1817 a fifth branch was established at Leesburg, at which time about fifty members were admitted. Though by 1820, the Ohio Society had gained 169 members, it never played a very prominent part in the peace society movement.

The third American peace society organized in the year 1815 was at Boston, Massachusetts, December 26, one year and a day after the publication there of Worcester's epoch-making tract. Meanwhile, in the course of the same year, Worcester had undertaken the publication of a peace magazine. Credit for the Massachusetts establishment, however, is also due Dr. William Ellery Channing, who, over a period of several years had been delivering occasional discourses on the subject of war. As early as 1809, he preached a sermon upon "Peace on Earth", and the year following, inspired by the European wars, preached one on the wastefulness and wickedness of wars. Other sermons directed against this evil followed in 1812 and 1814, and in 1816 a discourse before an assembly of Congregational ministers was published and widely circulated. There can be no doubt that these sermons had great influence in molding public opinion in Massachusetts against

war, for Channing was a leading clergyman of his day. He and Worcester were co-workers in the peace movement in Massachusetts, and officers of the society from its inception. The first meeting of the society was held in Channing's study.
(28)

(29)
On December 28, twenty-two members, including the Governor of Massachusetts, the President of Harvard College and several professors,
(28)
signed the constitution of the new society, and on January 11, 1816, its establishment was completed by
(30)
the appointment of officers.

The first officers of the Massachusetts Society included Hon. William Phillips, President; Hon. Thomas Dawes, Vice-President; Deacon Elisha Ticknor, Treasurer; Rev. Noah Worcester, Corresponding Secretary. There were also a recording secretary and a board of 6 trustees.

The object of the society, as expressed in its constitution,
(31)
was to enlighten men concerning the evils of war. It cited several indications to justify its hope of ultimate success. Membership dues were fixed at a dollar a year, and persons of all denominations were invited to join the society. The formation of other societies was to be encouraged in the United States and in foreign countries by the circulation of tracts, and by correspondence.

This society grew more rapidly than its two predecessors and from the start assumed the leadership. At the close of
(32)
its second year its membership had reached 304, 70 of whom were ministers of various religious denominations, but it al-

(33)
so contained some prominent civil figures.

The third annual report shows an addition of 246 members, bringing the total to 550, and by 1821, the number had increased to 882, scattered among the main society at Boston and twelve auxiliary societies, eight of which were located in Massachusetts, three in New Hampshire, and one in Connecticut.
(34)

The leaders were surprised at the rapidity of its growth, due to its meeting with very little opposition, and being hindered only by inadequate funds. Prince Galitzin of Russia, a close friend and adviser of Alexander I, was reckoned as an honorary member of the society. Though the Quaker element in Massachusetts was rather small, the work of Quakers in other states in distributing tracts and producing some of their own was appreciated.
(33)

By 1828, it is estimated, there existed fifty peace societies scattered among twelve different states of the Union. A greater number of these were to be found in the New England states, and include the following: Maine, at Portland (1817), and Minot, the home of William Ladd; New Hampshire, at Portsmouth, Jaffry, and Hollis; one in Vermont (1828); Massachusetts, at Cambridge, Salem, Brighton, Watertown, Byfield, Newton, Cummington, Hingham, Billerica, Plainfield, Shelburn, East Haddam, South Reading, and Royalston, as well as the one at Boston, (1815). In Connecticut, for some time there was one state society, an auxiliary of the Massachusetts Society, but by 1833, there existed a county peace society in every
(36) (37) (38)

(39)
 county of the State. Rhode Island had the Rhode Island and
 Providence Plantation Peace Society at Providence (1817),⁽⁴⁰⁾
 with eighty-two subscribers its first year. In New York so-
 cieties existed at New York City (1815), Cayuga Peace Socie-
 ty at Scipio (1817),⁽⁴⁰⁾ Chenango and Highland Counties (1818),⁽⁴⁰⁾
 Schenectady and Albany.⁽⁴¹⁾ In Pennsylvania, the Society of
 Young Friends in Berks County, organized to distribute peace
 tracts, and a Peace Society of Pennsylvania (1822) was es-
 tablished by Rev. Henry Holcome, an ex-Revolutionary War sol-
 dier, author of several peace tracts, and pastor of the Bap-
 tist Church in Philadelphia, with 170 subscribers its first
 year.⁽⁴³⁾ In the South there were societies at Raleigh, North
Carolina, (1820), among whose members were reckoned "five
 ministers of the Gospel and a Judge of the United States Su-
 preme Court";⁽⁴⁴⁾ and a Georgia Peace Society, which was formed
 as an auxiliary to the Pennsylvania society;⁽⁴³⁾ and in the
 West, besides the five previously mentioned in Ohio, two so-
 cieties were founded in Vigo County, Indiana.⁽⁴⁵⁾ In addition to
 these The Western Association of the New Jerusalem Church,⁽⁴⁵⁾
 and the Conference of the Methodist Reformed Church in New
 York assumed the character of peace societies.⁽⁴⁶⁾

Increasing zeal and numbers created the need for con-
 solidation in the peace movement in order to carry on effec-
 tive work. The first move toward this end came from the Maine
 Peace Society, February 10, 1826, when it voted "that it is
 expedient to adopt measures for the formation of a national
 peace society".⁽⁴⁷⁾ This action was instigated by William Ladd

(48)
 of Minot, Maine, who, influenced by Worcester's "Solemn Review"⁽⁴⁸⁾, had become deeply interested in the cause, and after the formation of the national society, became the very soul⁽⁴⁹⁾ of it. Similar action by various other societies followed, and the Maine, Portsmouth, Massachusetts, and Windham County societies appointed agents to go to New York and Philadelphia to confer with leaders there. A constitution drawn up by the corresponding secretary of the Massachusetts Society was accepted by the Pennsylvania Society, February 18, 1828, and subsequently received the approval of all to which it was⁽⁴⁹⁾ presented.

In accordance with a provision of this constitution the first meeting of the new society was held at New York City, May 8, when the original constitution was adopted with a few changes, and there was founded the American Peace Society, which exists today, an active agent in the cause. It declared as its basic principle, "we believe the custom of war to be contrary to the principles of the Christian religion, subversive of the liberty of mankind, and destructive of their happiness; -- a horrible custom, which every one is called⁽⁴⁹⁾ upon to do what he can to abolish". In its object, as stated in the constitution, not only did the society propose to "diffuse light respecting the evils of war", the object of the Massachusetts Peace Society, but in addition, to seek, "the⁽⁴⁹⁾ best means of effecting its abolition", a much more positive, aggressive, and constructive statement. This expresses the new spirit infused into the American peace movement by the new consolidation and by the remarkable leadership of Will-

iam Ladd.

Annual dues of the American Peace Society were to be five dollars instead of one. The business of the society was to be conducted by a board of twenty directors, who oversaw its affairs. There was to be an annual meeting at which the directors and the treasurer presented annual reports. Any part of the constitution was changeable by a vote of three-fourths of the representatives in a regular meeting, except the object of the organization which "shall never be changed". Representation of auxiliary societies in the meetings of the national society was based on the amount of money paid into the treasury of the national society. (49)

The first Board of Directors was composed of twenty-two members, including two from Maine, one of whom was William Ladd; three for New Hampshire; three for Massachusetts, including Noah Worcester and John Tappan; two for Rhode Island, Moses and Nicholas Brown of Providence; three for Connecticut. New York was given six, including Anson G. Phelps and David Low Dodge; Pennsylvania, two; and Ohio, one, Dr. Stephen B. Cleavland of Cincinnati. (49)

Soon after the formation of the society a declaration of its position was issued, from which the following statements are selected: "We receive into our communion all who seek to abolish war, whether they hold to lawfulness of defensive war, or condemn all war in every shape". The society was declared non-political. The closing statement enables one to understand the high idealism of this stage of the movement: (50)

"Our principles were promulgated by the song of angels, which produced peace on earth, and good will to man; they soar far above the temporary and local affairs of states and empires; they are as extensive as the world, and lasting as eternity. Wherever breathes a human soul, we hail him brother, whatever may be the color of his skin, or the articles of his creed, we delight to do him good, and to extend to him the peaceful principles of our blessed Saviour. We are not confined by geographical boundaries, natural or artificial, but seek 'the greatest good for the greatest number'."

William Ladd was made the executive officer of the Society, and during the last four years of his life served as its president.
(51)

Contemporaneously numerous organized peace societies were being organized in Europe.

The long period of wars between England and France, extending almost without interruption from 1793-1815, produced a strong desire for peace, especially in England. But because of the intense patriotic spirit there, no anti-war movement dared to appear until peace had been made. However, as early as 1796, a tract, "War Inconsistent with the Doctrine and Example of Jesus Christ", by J. Scott, was published.
(52)

Also, Dr. Thomas Chalmers, a noted English clergyman, delivered some pioneer sermons on the subject of peace.
(53)

However, the first definite suggestion on record for the establishment of peace societies in England is found in a discourse of Rev. David Bogue, D. D., a Congregational minister, in October of the year 1813. Dr. Bogue had been prominent in the founding of various beneficent organizations, including the London Missionary Society, the British and Foreign Bible Society, and

(54)
the Religious Tract Society.

Among the most outstanding Friends in England at this time was William Allen, a typical reforming Quaker, interested in all sorts of benevolent enterprises, including Bible Societies, Tract Societies, education, poor relief, prison reform, slavery, and many others. When in the summer of 1814, Tsar Alexander of Russia, and Frederick William III of Prussia visited England, William Allen headed a delegation of Friends who presented them with religious addresses. Alexander, by nature mystical and religious, and his sister, the Duchess of Oldenburg, evinced great interest in the Friends and were taken by Allen to a Quaker meeting. Later they inspected the home of a Quaker family. This sort of interest led, in 1815, to Alexander's Holy Alliance proposal. (55)

The first actual society in England arose among the Society of Friends. In the Journal of William Allen, there appears under date of June 7, 1814, this brief notation: "Peace committee. A meeting to consider a new society to spread tracts, etc. against war". (56) This meeting was held at Mr. Allen's house in London, with several benevolent gentlemen present. But while all agreed on the expediency of the proposition, no steps toward definite organization were taken just then, aside from agreeing that those present should hand Mr. Allen their ideas concerning a constitution, which he should consider in developing a proposal to be considered at some future meeting. (57) On June 6, 1815, less than two weeks before the battle of Waterloo, another meeting was held, at which only

three were present. They adopted the following resolution:

"It seems expedient that the following objects should constitute the basis of the association to be formed; viz., a society for the purpose of circulating tracts and diffusing information tending to show that all war is inconsistent with the interests of mankind and is contrary to the spirit of Christianity".⁽⁵⁸⁾

A letter proposing organization, dated in April, addressed to William Allen who edited "The Philanthropist", was published in the July, 1815, number of that magazine. Some have cited this as the prelude of the formation of the London Society.⁽⁶⁰⁾ but it must be remembered that a meeting to consider

this matter had been held ten months before the letter was written. The letter contained the same sentiments as the Worcester tract,⁽⁶⁰⁾ and it is possible that it was inspired by it, since the latter had had ample time for reaching England, and was used as propaganda there shortly afterward. But even if it were so it could not be justly claimed that the American pamphlet caused the creation of the London Society, inasmuch as it was the direct outgrowth of the independent efforts of William Allen and his associates. It has been frequently stated with certainty or near certainty that the three earliest American societies and the London society were founded without knowledge of the intention or existence of each other,⁽⁶¹⁾

but this is incorrect. For American obligation is admitted by the following excerpt from the constitution of the Massachusetts Peace Society declaring:⁽⁶²⁾ "By their late dreadful

sufferings, the attention of the European nations is unusually excited to the guilt and miseries of war; and with joy we have learned, that Peace Societies have been proposed, if not already established on the other side of the Atlantic." On the other hand the peace leaders in London were encouraged in completing their already projected society by the knowledge of the organization in Massachusetts. (63)

On June 1, 1816, Mr. Allen summoned a large and enthusiastic committee which discussed the project and appointed another committee to complete the organization for the proposed society. This committee met June 7, and voted to have printed an edition of a thousand copies of Worcester's "Solemn Review", and appointed three of their number to prepare a series of resolutions to be considered at a future meeting. (64) A week later, June 14, the plan of the society was definitely arranged and the resolutions passed. The first regular business meeting of the Committee was held the following October. (65)

The original number of members was ten, most of whom were Quakers, like Allen and Price, but it included others like Thomas Clarkson, the well-known anti-slavery agitator. (66) Joseph Tragelles Price, an ironmaster of Neath Abbey was another active founder. Indeed some have given Price credit for originating the idea of the first society in England. (67) Like Allen, a Quaker, his positive testimony had been confirmed in a remarkable way by an event which occurred during the recent war with France. One of his unarmed trading

ships was captured by the enemy, and when asked why it was unarmed the French were informed that it belonged to men "who believed that all war was forbidden by Christianity". According to the story it was allowed to return home unmolested, by the gentlemen freebooters of Napoleon.

The London society took the name of "The Society for the Promotion of Permanent and Universal Peace", illustrative of English fondness for lengthy and bigworded society names. It declared its object was "to print and circulate tracts, and diffuse information tending to show, that war is inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity, and the true interest of mankind, and to point out the means best calculated to maintain permanent and universal peace, on the basis of true Christian Principles." The society was to be non-sectarian in membership and officers, and its business was to be conducted by a group of not more than thirty-six, called the Committee. At the outset the committee consisted of William Allen, Thomas Clarkson, John Clarkson, William Crawford, Charles Stokes Dudley, Rev. Thomas Harper, Robert Marsden, Joseph Tragelless Price, Evan Rees, John Scott, Frederick Smith, and Thomas Sturge. Mr. Marsden, first chairman
(68)
(69)
of the Committee, issued an address from London, January 9, 1817, which largely was a repetition of the resolutions of June 14. His plea was based on religious-humanitarian grounds, and contained this statement: "After so many years of bloodshed, the time has at length arrived when great numbers of

different religious persuasions in this country, on the continent, and in North America are decided in their opinion that war cannot be justified on Christian principles, and others are beginning on the same grounds to question its lawfulness...."

The receipts of the society its first year were £211 15s. 10d., and increased the next year to £367 11s. 7d. The number of subscribers during the second year was nearly trebled.
(70)

During the first year auxiliary societies were formed at Swansea and Neath and Tavistock; and by the end of the second year at Darlington, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Hertford, Worcester, and Frome, and a ladies' association at Lymington. In 1820, auxiliaries were founded in the more important cities of Bath, Bristol, Southampton, and Plymouth. In Scotland peace societies were organized in Glasgow (1817), Dundee (1818), and Edinburgh (1819); also they were found in Ireland, Nova Scotia and Canada.
(71) (73) (74) (75) (75) (71) (76) (77) (77)

The same revulsion against war was felt among certain classes in France, although naturally under the conditions of the Revolutionary-Napoleonic era it was not developed as in England or America. However, about the year 1815, several peace plans were published there and considerable interest was shown in pacific topics. Moreover, French religious journals reported the proceedings of the English and American peace societies with favorable comment. Abbe Gregoire's "La Chronique Religieuse", called their objective "highly
(78)

laudable" and reviewed the history of peace sentiment since the time of Erasmus. Similarly the journal of M. Charles Coquerel, "Annales Protestantes", remarked, "....it is a spectacle worthy of admiration" to see pious men engaged in the work of bringing peace to the world and promised to record accounts of their operations from time to time.

Largely through the influence of Joseph Tragelless
(79)
Price, an organization of peace sentiment was begun in France, and late in 1820, word was received in England that a group of prominent Frenchmen had formed a committee with the intention of developing there a society to promote peace
(80)
on Christian principles. It included the names of Baron de Stael, Comte de la Borde, M. Marron, president of the French Protestant Church, M. Wurtz, an eminent bookseller, M. Stapfer, a professor of Theology, and M. Willm, a minister and instructor of young men.

Difficulties in establishing such a society proved greater in France than in England or America and several meetings resulted in no definite organization due to the fact that public opinion there was little prepared to countenance direct opposition to the war spirit. As it was felt that if their efforts were directly aimed against war public ridicule would render their society ineffectual, they decided to form an organization embracing numerous other benevolent objectives. Thus a society bearing the name, "La Societe des
(80)
Amis de la Morale Chretienne et de la Paix" was created, commonly called "The Society of Christian Morals". Its prospectus,

which appeared August 15, 1821, declared its objective was to influence mankind "to abjure all anger, all hatred, all unhappy dissension -- to love one another -- to treat each other as brethren, and finally to seek to procure peace."⁽⁸¹⁾

This French society proclaimed religious liberty, urged the confession of religious convictions and claimed credit for much social work, including the promotion of savings banks, abolition of lotteries, and the closing of the gambling houses in France. In 1843, it was engaged in agitating for the emancipation of slaves, the abolition of capital punishment, suppression of torture in prison, and for laws tending to increase morality among the masses, temperance in individuals, and to promote religious education. It was the only one in France which up to that time had openly declared itself a peace society, and opposed to duelling and revolts as well.⁽⁸²⁾ The presidents of the society up to 1843, were, in order, the elder Marquis de la Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, the Duc de Broglie, M. Guizot, M. Benjamin Constant, and the younger Marquis de la Rochefoucauld-Liancourt.⁽⁸²⁾

The membership of the French society was of a distinctly different type from the English and American ones, comprising principally liberals, free-thinkers, economists, socialists, etc., who gave the movement a more practical and less religious note.⁽⁸³⁾ The fact that reforming zealotry on the continent was less marked than in England and America helps to explain why the Society of Christian Morals was so divided as to its aims, inasmuch as there was not a sufficient

number interested to justify a separate organization for each separate purpose, nor could all agree upon one common objective. In 1841, however, there was formed within the society a special committee on peace. (83)

Sympathy and some connection existed in the period prior to 1843 between the French society and the peace societies. In the early '40's the London Peace society sent their agent, Mr. Stephen Rigaud to the continent on at least three occasions, in behalf of the cause of peace. He appeared before the Society of Christian Morals in Paris, and on January 11, 1841, proposed to the council of the society, in behalf of the one which he represented, the establishment of a prize fund of 1,250 francs for treatises on the promotion of permanent and universal peace, a plan which had been used successfully by the American society. The offer was accepted, and rules were drawn up governing the contest. Not only was the essay to show that war was a violence to humanity and contrary to the Christian religion, but also the best means of promoting and securing universal and permanent peace and of adjusting international disputes without resorting to war. It is interesting that this offer was made less than a month after the removal of the remains of Napoleon from St. Helena to Paris, at a time when the war spirit was running high there. Rigaud returned in the spring of 1842 to be present when the awards were made, and before returning home visited friends of peace in Switzerland, along the Rhine, and in Belgium, and a year later returned to advertise the international peace

(84)
 conference to be held in London that year. The Paris committee resolved to send copies of the prize essays bound in one volume to the King of France, the two princes, the leading French ministers, and to the rulers of the various civilized countries of the world.
 (85)

During the period of the '30's and '40's in France, under the kingship of the "bourgeois" Louis Philippe, increased interest was shown in pacifism. Noteworthy among the French peace advocates of the period was St. Simon, the great socialist leader, and product of the "Industrial Revolution" then sweeping France with full force. St. Simon's inspiration, however, was primarily economic and social rather than religious and his peace ideas were of a more practical nature. Registering this quickened interest in 1847, Francisque Bouvel, M. Ziegler, Denis Potonie, Frederic Bastiat, M. Riglet, and others of the Societé du Libre Exchange considered the formation of a peace society, but were hindered by the unsettled political conditions due to the agitation leading to the February Revolution of 1848, and the consequent suspension of the right to hold meetings.
 (86)

Another European country, Switzerland, saw the formation of a peace society, December 1, 1830. Count Jean Jacques de Sellon (1782-1839) of an old Calvinistic noble family holding their title from the Holy Roman Empire, was its founder.
 (87)
 In his youth de Sellon had studied in Geneva and Tuscany, becoming acquainted with the various governments of Europe, and in addition, with the peace plans of Abbe de

St. Pierre, Henry IV, and others. Tuscany, thanks to the influence of the Eighteenth Century Italian crime and prison reform agitator, Beccaria, had a very enlightened code of criminal law which had abolished the death penalty. On returning to Geneva, where in 1816, he took a seat in the sovereign council of the city-republic, de Sellon advocated many liberal reforms, such as the discontinuing of the death penalty. He was also interested in the cause of women and in popular initiative of legislation. Some personal experiences during the Napoleonic wars gave him decided anti-war views and were an important factor in his founding the Geneva Peace Society. Having formed the Geneva Society, he informed the various sovereigns of Europe of its existence, and received several favorable replies, especially a letter from the King of Prussia. During the next few years following 1830, de Sellon wrote articles on peace, several of which were published in the journals of Switzerland, France, Italy, and England. The Geneva Society corresponded regularly with those in England and America. Its first officers were the Count de Sellon, president; M. Boissier, vice-president; M. Ramu, secretary; and M. Moulton, treasurer.

Having indicated the formation of Peace Societies, there remains to be noted their isolated endeavor in the period 1815-43.

The American peace societies were very active in publishing and circulating tracts in America, and almost from the outset, a connection was made with the London society

and exchanges of pamphlets were made. Worcester's "Solemn Review of the Custom of War", discussed above, ran through numerous editions in this country and England, and was even translated into foreign languages and circulated on the Continent of Europe. Other important publications of the Massachusetts Peace Society ^(88a) were the "Friend of Peace", a quarterly begun by Noah Worcester in 1815 and continued till the year 1828, also "A Sermon on War by the Rev. W. E. Channing", ^(88a) and two circulars of the society. Early publications of the ^(89a) New York Society include Dodge's "Mediator's Kingdom not of this World" and "War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ", and "Observations of the Kingdom of Peace under the Benign Reign of the Messiah"; "The Life of Man In-violate by the Laws of Jesus Christ, Shewn in two Sermons", by Rev. Aaron Cleveland; "Thoughts on the Practical Advantage of those who hold the Doctrine of Peace over those who Vindicate War"; and "Letters to Caleb Strong, Esquire, Late Governor of Massachusetts, shewing War to be Inconsistent with the Laws of Christ and the Good of Mankind".

⁽⁹⁰⁾

In its first two years, the Massachusetts society alone distributed nearly 8,700 tracts and 5,000 copies of the two circular letters throughout the United States, Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and even a few to Great Britain, France, Russia, Santo Domingo, and Asia, sending the last by ⁽⁹¹⁾ Congregational and Baptist missionaries.

The first American peace periodical, Noah Worcester's "Friend of Peace" initiated in 1815, already has been men-

tioned. The second such periodical was the "Harbinger of Peace", edited by William Ladd, under the auspices of the American Peace Society. It first appeared May 1828, and continued under this name until the May-June issue of 1831, when it was doubled in size and re-christened the "Calu-⁽⁹⁴⁾met", having attained a circulation of 15,000 copies. Ladd continued it as a bimonthly until the March-April number of 1835. "Its editorial essays and poems are for the most part excellent in thought and style, and, together with the many reports, they represent an interesting picture of early nineteenth-century views in America."⁽⁹²⁾ In 1834, William Watson of the Connecticut Peace Society at Hartford began the publication of the "American Advocate of Peace", which in 1835 was adopted by the American Peace Society to replace "The Calumet" as its official organ. Soon after the death of Mr. Watson in 1836, it was removed to Boston where, in June, 1837, it appeared as the "Advocate of Peace".⁽⁹³⁾ There can be no doubt that these publications reached many readers and did much to popularize peace ideas, and led to the founding of more peace societies.

A schism occurred in the American peace movement at the Peace Convention of 1838, when certain leaders in the American Anti-Slavery Society withdrew from the main peace society to form the Non-Resistance Society. The difficulty was that the American Peace Society did not go to the limit of declaring itself opposed to defensive as well as offensive war. The Declaration of Sentiments of the Non-Resis-

tance Society, published in 1838, contained this statement: "Our principles forbid the doing of evil that good may come and lead us to reject and to entreat the oppressed to reject the use of all carnal weapons for deliverance from bondage; relying solely upon those which are spiritual and mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds"⁽⁹⁶⁾. This was written by William Lloyd Garrison, a leader in the new group. Adin Ballou was another leader. Following the John Brown raid of 1859, at a meeting of the Worcester County, South Division Anti-Slavery Society, violence was condoned, a resolution being adopted contrary to the principles of the society, and Garrison now was one of the first to depart from the non-resistance principle.⁽⁹⁶⁾

The practice of memorializing magistrates and legislatures was taken up by the peace societies from the first. In May 1819, the Massachusetts society memorialized the United States Congress, praying that the principle and practice of privateering be banished from the legislative code. The Maine and Raleigh (N. C.) societies likewise sent memorials, denouncing privateering as a "blood relation to piracy".⁽⁹⁷⁾

The next year the Massachusetts society presented another memorial to Congress, asking that the United States Government make a formal declaration of pacific principles and that it deliberately inquire into the methods of promoting peace. The address further states,⁽⁹⁵⁾

"...We trust that milder principles would be introduced into the conduct of national hostilities; that the reference of nation-

al controversies to an impartial umpire would gradually be established as the law of the Christian world; and that national compacts would be formed for the express purpose of reducing the enormous and ruinous extent of military establishments..."

Individuals in New York, appreciative of Tsar Alexander's labors in the cause of peace sent him a volume of essays, which he acknowledged under date of July 4, 1817:

"....The efforts which you and other individuals and societies in North America are now making to promote love and peace among men, are worthy of the imitation of every well-wisher to the peace and happiness of the world, and in these labors of charity I wish you every possible success...." (98)

One of the most effective methods of creating interest in the movement hit upon by the American society was the prize essay award, which was also taken up in England and France. In 1831, through the generosity of two individuals, the Directors of the American Peace Society were enabled to offer to world-wide competition prizes of \$500 for the best and \$100 for the second best dissertation on the subject, "A Congress of Nations for the Amicable Adjustment of National Disputes, and for the Promotion of Universal Peace, Without Recourse to Arms." (99) Of the thirty-seven essays received, the board referred seven to the judges, --Joseph Story, William Wirt, and John M'Lean, --who were unable to decide which of the five best had greatest merit, so they recommended that the total \$600 be divided equally among the five. (100) So successful was this first venture that almost at once the

Board of the American Peace Society offered another prize, this time \$1,000 for the best essay on the same subject. The avowed purpose was to effect a complete change in men's minds by showing war to be needless, and that "it is as practicable as rational for nations to decide their differences by reason; that a resort to the sword is irrationally brutal, and cruel, and wicked, and absurd." Again the judges, --John Quincy Adams, Chancellor Kent, and Daniel Webster --, were unable to agree upon any one essay as best, so they refused to award the prize to any one person. Five of the essays were of unusual merit, and the best passages of the remainder were worked over by William Ladd, who, adding some original ideas, developed a sixth essay, which with the other five appeared in one sizeable octave volume in 1840. A copy was presented to the President of the United States, to the cabinet members, to all the state governors, to every foreign ambassador in Washington, and to every European ruler.

(101)
(102)
(103)
(104)

The Ladd Plan deserves much more than casual mention here, inasmuch as it is a real contribution to the development of international government, and as such ranks with the projects of Henry IV, Cruce, Penn, St. Pierre, Kant, and others. It anticipated much that later has been worked out in the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907, and in the League of Nations of more recent date.

The plan calls for a Congress of Nations and a Court of Nations, and its really unique contribution is that it advan-

ces the preferability of the Congress and the Court existing independently of each other, though united in the same plan and cooperating with each other. This added the "element necessary to give precedent for nearly every item in the program of a League of Nations proposed in 1919. Ladd borrowed the idea of a court independent from the congress from the government of the United States. The Congress was to be transient or periodical and to be composed of representatives of the various civilized nations, each with one vote, -- thus recognizing the doctrine of equality of states. Necessary regulations and bye-laws governing the Congress require only a majority vote. New members were to be admitted upon accepting the rules already adopted and the laws of nations "enacted" by the Congress. Upon completing its organization, the Congress was to proceed to consider the first principles of international law, none of which were to be established without the unanimous vote of the Congress and ratification by all the represented Governments. When ratified by all, such "laws" were to have the binding force of international treaties. Internal affairs of nations, such as insurrections, revolts, or form of government, lay beyond the province of the Congress, which was solely concerned with intercourse between nations in relation to peace and war. Ladd divided its functions into four general divisions: (1) to define the rights of belligerents toward each other, thereby attempting to decrease the horrors of wars and their frequency, and to promote their termination; (2) to settle the

rights of neutrals and diminish evils inflicted upon them by war; (3) to adopt useful measures for the encouragement of peaceful pursuits; and (4) to organize, as one of its first acts, a Court of Nations.

The number of representative to the Court from each state was to be determined by the Congress, but Ladd suggested two. Its power was to be merely advisory, with no material power to enforce its decisions. Its jurisdiction was non-compulsory, covering only those cases referred to it by the free consent of parties concerned. Members were to be appointed by the respective governments for terms agreed upon by the Congress, which was also to determine the method of paying their salaries.

The court was to choose its own officers. It was to meet annually to carry on business, at no fixed place, but should never meet in a country concerned in a case to be heard. Verdicts were to be reached by a majority vote -- not unanimous, as in the case of the Congress. Its verdicts were to contain a statement of the facts of the case, together with the steps in the reasoning used in reaching the decision. As a basis for rendering a decision, the Court was to observe existing treaties and the "laws" enacted by the Congress of Nations and ratified by all the member nations. If these did not cover the case in question, then the judges were to follow the principles of equity and justice. It was to have power to offer mediation where war threatened or arose, without being invited. In internal controversies such

as disputed succession it was not to offer its verdict without the invitation of all factions, though it was free to propose reconciliation. The Court was to suggest questions for the consideration of the Congress, such as new and unsettled principles.

Ladd's plan recognized the force of public opinion as the means of making itself effective, as this statement indicates: "A nation would not be justified in the opinion of the world in going to war, when there was an able and impartial umpire to judge its case; and many a dispute would be quashed at the outset if it were known that the world would require an impartial investigation of it by able judges."

Another notable project, of a less pretentious nature, though more practical for its day, was first advanced about 1840 by Judge William Jay of New York. It advocated the insertion in treaties between nations of a clause binding them to settle their future disputes by the arbitration of a friendly power or powers. This really is a corollary of the Ladd plan, and could certainly be used as a step toward the larger project. Arbitration clauses in treaties by 1840 were by no means a new thing, but the specific proposal that nations deliberately bind themselves to observe the general principle of arbitration was, indeed, a step forward. These two proposals were adopted by the peace societies on both side of the Atlantic and were embodied in the resolutions of their great international peace congresses of the '40's

and '50's, thus becoming chief planks in their program.

The London Peace Society used the same methods in reaching the public as did those in America. Its official organ, the "Herald of Peace", first made its appearance at London, January 1819, as a monthly, then quarterly, bi-monthly, and finally monthly again, and is still so published today. Its stated policy, no doubt a wise one, was to avoid party politics, for "the cause is a religious, not a political one; and the moment we lose sight of the one, and in any way verge towards the other, the best pillar of the support is lost, and the fabric totters."⁽¹⁰⁷⁾

Some of the early tracts published in England were Worcester's "Solemn Review of the Custom of War", Jonathan Dymond's "Observations on the applicability of the Pacific Principles of the New Testament in the conduct of States, and on the Limitation which those Principles Impose on the Rights of Self-defence," also Thomas Clarkson's "An Essay on the Doctrine and Practice of the Early Christians, as they Relate to War." These titles indicate that the basis of the peace arguments in England, as has been seen also in the case of America, was religious. In the first year of its existence, the London society issued 46,000 tracts and addresses,⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ and in the second, 128,000. By 1835, 720,245 pieces of literature had been printed and circulated, and by 1839⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ about 967,000.⁽¹¹⁰⁾ Likewise meetings were held at various places throughout the Kingdom where agents of the society preached the doctrines of peace, planted its seeds among the

masses, and organized them into societies to carry on the work. Among the prominent agents of the society in this early period were Rev. James Hargreaves and Dr. Bowring. (109) (111)

Peace missionaries even crossed over into Continental Europe as early as June 1819. A German gentleman wrote that 5,000 copies of one tract of the society had been printed there, 2,000 of which were taken to the Leipzig fair for distribution. (112) A more strategic distribution point for Germany, and all Europe, would have been difficult to find, for the fair attracted multitudes from all parts of the Continent. In December of 1819, a letter was received from a man of Groningen, Holland, who had met a member of the London Committee in France, and who urged the London society to extend its work to Holland, where the writer felt the universal religious feeling would insure success. (113) Tracts were scattered throughout Spain and Portugal. The Cortes of Portugal ordered a set of tracts of the Peace Society placed in their public library. A correspondent of the society at Gibraltar distributed pamphlets in Spanish and French, those in Spanish being sent into the interior, where he was told "they are read by all classes that can obtain them", those in French were given to passing ships for distribution in various countries, including Piedmont, Southern France, and Sweden. (114) The agent requested an additional supply of tracts in Spanish, French, Italian, and English, but stated that those in German and Dutch were of little use there. He felt that a well written tract would be useful for distribution

among the quarrelsome Moroccans. Whether or not this work bore fruit, it is important that Europe in general was informed of the existence of such a movement.

Something has already been said of the journeys of Mr. Rigaud to France and his relations with the Society of Christian Morals. On these journeys he spread tracts through France, Switzerland, the Rhineland, and Belgium. On his trip of 1842, he visited prominent citizens at Lyons, who expressed themselves strongly in favor of his principles, largely through economic reasons, "though I cannot say I believe they all adopted to its fullest extent the religious principles of our society." Here he met a man interested in the improvement of the Greeks, who was making a collection of books for the University at Athens. Rigaud gave copies of Ladd's essay and also tracts in English and French to add to the collection. He next visited in turn Geneva, Lausanne, Berne, Basle, Strasburg, Mainz, Frankfort, Bonn, Cologne, and Aix-la-Chapelle. In the German cities he was handicapped by his lack of knowledge of the German language. In Belgium he visited Liege, Mons, and Brussels, and succeeded in laying a foundation for peace societies in the last two places.

(115)

The London Society about the year 1841, offered a prize of 100 guineas for the best peace essay, and twenty guineas for the next best. The first award went to Mr. H. Macnamara of Hammersmith, whose article was widely distributed and was read as a paper at the first international peace conference held in London, 1843.

Thomas Clarkson, famous for his work in the cause of the slave, and one of the founders of the London Peace Society, was sent by the Committee of the Society to the Congress of the powers held in Aix-la-Chapelle in the fall of 1818. Clarkson carried with him a set of handsomely bound tracts and an address from the peace society to present to Emperor Alexander of Russia, who had on numerous occasions shown himself favorably disposed toward moral and religious appeals. On the evening of October 19, Clarkson had a two-hour conference with the Emperor, in which the slave trade, the Society for the Education of the Poor, and the Society for the Distribution of the Bible were discussed along with other philanthropic movements. The Emperor expressed great satisfaction with the peace societies and, characteristically, "was of the opinion that the peaceable times prophesied in the Holy Scriptures were hastening on, and that they most assuredly would come to pass. 'Teach', said his majesty, 'the rising generation to read, and give them the Holy Scriptures, the only foundation of true morals, and you lay the axe at the root of every vicious custom. War, itself, among others, must give way'." Tracts were also sent to the Emperor of Austria, the King of Prussia, Prince Gal-
(116)
itzen, and other prominent persons. A Declaration of the Peace Committee was presented to the leaders at the Congress. It urged the acceptance of the principle of arbitration and suggested that if congresses of this nature were continued a perpetual congress would be established

"to arbitrate between contending states, and to promote
 (117)
 the happiness of the world".

Very early the peace society began to oppose British wars of imperialism. During the "Opium War" with China, (118) 1840-42, they memorialized Sir Robert Peel, expressing their opposition because it involved "a prodigal expenditure of British money, a melancholy loss of life, and a just and awful reproach upon the Christian religion", and asking for the immediate termination of the conflict and the adoption of practicable measures for the prevention of future collisions between England and any other country.

Most notable among the leaders of the organization period in America were David Low Dodge, Noah Worcester, William Ellery Channing, William Jay, and William Ladd. (118)

Mr. Dodge, the father of peace societies, was born in the year 1774, at Brooklyn, Connecticut, the son of a farmer and carpenter. He was reared in a strictly religious atmosphere. As a boy he received several vivid impressions of war from the American Revolution, in the course of which two half-brothers died. His formal education was slight, gained between the ages of six and fourteen years by intermittent attendance at various schools, but he was of a studious nature and by borrowing books was able to round out his culture. As a young man he taught school successfully, at the same time developing a lively interest in religion, and becoming more and more concerned with moral and social problems. He married the daughter of a clergyman who was

something of a local poet and one of the earliest abolitionists in Connecticut.

Mr. Dodge left teaching to become a trader, entering business in Norwich. Later he was head of dry goods firms in Hartford and other Connecticut towns. In 1805 he joined in partnership with relatives of his wife in the establishment of a large importing and jobbing store in New York City, which remained his principal residence until his death in 1852. Due to the European wars the partners were forced into bankruptcy and Dodge for a time established cotton factories in Connecticut, but later, returned to dry goods business in New York. He was deeply interested in the welfare of his workers and, characteristic of the period, patronized numerous philanthropic organizations, some of which were the Christian Friendly Society for the Promotion of Morals and Religion, the New York Bible Society, the New York Tract Society, and was the founder of the first peace society. For many years he was an elder in the Presbyterian Church, and was greatly interested in theological discussion and history. He was the author of several well-known peace tracts and served on the board of directors of the American Peace Society until his death. Dodge belonged to the radical wing of the society who opposed all war as unchristian. It is appropriate to note here that several of Dodge's descendants have been outstanding cultural, moral, and religious leaders.

(119)

Dr. Noah Worcester, D. D. was born in Hollis, New Hampshire, in 1758. His family being poor, he was denied the privilege of college training, and what education he acquired came through his own effort. Worcester served as a fifer in the Continental Army in 1775, and for a short time in 1777, as fife major. He married young and was soon loaded down with family cares, but despite this fact continued the process of self-education, and before he was thirty, was able to enter the ministry. His first parish was too poor to support him and his family, so he was forced to combine farming with his religious duties. He made the shoes for his own family, and kept ink and paper beside his work bench, jotting down ideas which occurred to him in his work. His "Solemn Review of the Custom of War", discussed above, was the most influential tract published by the peace societies up to 1840, and was a great stimulus in the cause. During 1813-18, Worcester edited "The Christian Disciple", and for a number of years was also editor of "The Friend of Peace". He was the first corresponding secretary of the Massachusetts Peace Society and continued to be interested in the movement until his death in 1837.

(120)

William Ellery Channing, 1780-1842, was a leading clergyman of his day. He received his degree at Harvard University in 1798. A Unitarian by religion, he was a liberal in social questions, his name being associated with most of the reform movements of his times, including education, temperance, intellectual freedom, peace and abolition. He fear-

lessly defended William Lloyd Garrison at a time when he was in disfavor with conservative Boston. Channing wrote much on theological, social and philanthropic themes, and possessed a literary style of clearness and vigor, though not especially ornate. He delivered a number of discourses on peace which were later circulated in tract form, and was one of the organizers of the Massachusetts society. He did not, however, take the radical view that all war is unjustifiable.

(121)

William Jay, 1789-1858, was a son of the statesman and first chief justice, John Jay. He received his education at Yale, where he graduated in 1808. Though forced by defective eyesight to give up his study of law, nevertheless between the years 1818-21, he served as Judge of Common Pleas in New York. Jay was interested in many benevolent movements. He was a founder of the American Bible Society in 1816. From 1835-37, he served as corresponding foreign secretary of the American Anti-Slavery Society. He wrote a good deal against slavery, but in both this and the peace movement he was inclined toward conservatism. For a decade he was president of the American Peace Society, and during the Mexican War, published a book, "War and Peace", 1848, in which he opposed the war with Mexico and advocated peace principles. His chief contribution to the peace cause was his proposal that nations include in their treaties a clause binding them to observe the general principle of arbitration in settling their differences. Jay's social promi-

nence and ability were notable assets to the cause.

The heroic figure of the American peace movement was
(122)
William Ladd, "the apostle of peace", born in the year 1778, at Exeter, New Hampshire. He studied at Exeter Academy and entered Harvard at fifteen. On graduating there in 1797, being too young to enter professional studies, he decided to see the world. He said later that he gained little knowledge or mental discipline in college, and what he did get, the salt water pretty much washed out. His father was engaged extensively in navigation, so Ladd embarked on one of his father's vessels as a passenger, but disliking idleness he assumed the work of a common sailor. On his second voyage he went as mate, and finally became commander of vessels owned by himself and his brothers.

In 1801 he embarked on what he felt would be a gainful as well as philanthropic enterprise in Florida, then a Spanish possession. His plan was to undermine slavery in Florida by introducing free laborers, and in this venture he transported settlers, largely Dutch emigrants, from Philadelphia. Some deserted, others became sick, and many were too lazy to work, so he gave up his project after five years, and returned to Portsmouth, where he engaged profitably in shipping again until the War of 1812 drove American commerce from the seas.

Ladd retired in 1812, to Minot, Maine, to become a "scientific" agriculturist. In this period he renewed his literary habits and did much reading, reflecting, and writ-

ing. Up to this time he had given religion little thought, but the timely rebuke of a blunt and honest Christian of Portland set a train of thoughts in operation which produced a revolution in his life. His conversion, which occurred in 1816, gave him new zeal, and consecrating himself to God and man, he began a remarkable career of philanthropy.

Soon after this change had occurred, Ladd first heard of the cause of peace from President Appleton of Bowdoin College. About the year 1823, gentlemen promoting a religious weekly, "The Christian Mirror", asked Ladd to contribute agricultural articles to their publication, but meanwhile he had perused some peace tracts, including the "Solomon Review", and felt inspired to contribute peace articles instead. Ladd continued to write till his articles filled a volume; then he wrote a second series. He thus made preparation for stepping into the place of Worcester upon his retirement from active peace work and from the publication of the "Friend of Peace".

Ladd not only was the principal founder of the American Peace Society in 1828, but at times it seemed that he was the Peace Society itself. He edited its periodicals, paid its bills from his own purse when its revenue was exhausted, issued its appeals, delivered lectures, and circulated its publications. At the tenth annual meeting of the board of directors, held in Boston, May 29, 1838, through gratitude for his services, it was resolved "that the great exertions

and sacrifices of the president of the American Peace Society, William Ladd, Esq., in the promotion of the peace cause, justly entitle him to the glorious title of the 'apostle of peace', a title which still clings to his name.

The Society's annual report of 1838, states that were it not for Ladd's exertions and sacrifices the Peace Society would soon cease to exist, that "there appears to be an idea afloat in the minds of many that Mr. Ladd will keep the peace cause from dying and that they are quite excusable if they will give a few paltry dollars per annum .. Ought the friends of peace to be willing to let that noble philanthropist continue to bear the burden any longer? The cause is not his; it is the cause of human nature." Ladd never accepted any pay for his services; financially the Society was a loss to him.

Ladd's peace writings include two volumes of essays and three large popular tracts. Two essays were on a Congress of Nations, the second one of which was reissued by the London Peace Society in an edition of 20,000 copies. He also wrote about a half-dozen juvenile volumes, and articles for the religious press, delivered sermons, lectures, and addresses, and carried on a wide correspondence.

"The Peace Cause was the magnet of his soul, the pole star of his life. He planned for it; he prayed for it; he toiled for it day and night, from one end of the year to the other; and finally on the altar of his favorite, fondly-cherished cause, did he sacrifice himself, a whole-burnt

(123)
offering."

In the fall of 1840, Ladd, disregarding the advice of friends, left for a speaking tour of western New York. He addressed large crowds in numerous important cities. At Peterborough, New York, he was forced to rest awhile at the home of Gerrit Smith, but upon regaining sufficient strength continued his journey. He spent four weeks in bed at Canandaigua, but was able at last to proceed to Buffalo, "sometimes attempting still three services on the Sabbath, and frequently obliged by the disease in his legs to sit during the deliverance of his discourses, and even to pause and rest in the midst of them. Several of his last sermons he preached on his knees." At length he was forced, against his will, to return home, and he died at Portsmouth the following spring.

This, verily, is the story of a hero in a great cause, and entitles William Ladd to a prominent position among the benefactors of mankind.

The correspondence of William Lloyd Garrison casts some interesting sidelights upon the personality of the man. In a letter of 1833, he says, "He (Ladd) is a good-natured man, but somewhat superficial," and in another, dated September 24, 1838, "the deep solemnity of the occasion was somewhat disturbed by the broad and irresistible humor of William Ladd. He is a huge and strange compound of fat, good nature, and benevolence."

The principal leaders of the London Peace Society were for the most part members of the Society of Friends, and were interested in numerous philanthropic causes. None is as outstanding in the work for peace as Worcester of Ladd in America, though some are world-wide figures in other movements.

(124)

Jonathan Dymond, 1796-1828, was a descendant of one of the oldest Quaker families in England. His chief importance in the cause of peace lies in his authorship of several tracts related to this subject which were used by the London Society. He founded the auxiliary society at Exeter in 1825, and for four years served on the Committee of the Peace Society. In 1823 Dymond published anonymously "An Enquiry into the Accordancy of War with the Principles of Christianity, and an Examination of the Philosophical Reasoning by Which it is Defended." Another of his tracts was "The Applicability of the Pacific Principles of the New Testament to the Conduct of States". His chief work, "An Essay on the Principles of Morality and on the Private and Political Rights and the Obligations of Mankind," appeared posthumously in 1829, for Dymond had died prematurely of consumption in 1828. Favorably reviewed by Southey in the January 1831 number of "The Quarterly Review", the work ran through five editions. This book treated the application rather than the theory of moral principles, attacking duelling, war, and lax morality generally.

Thomas Clarkson, 1760-1846, the son of a schoolmaster, was educated at St. Paul's and St. John's College, Cambridge.

(125)

His principal interest lay in the slavery question, and he worked tirelessly in England and upon the Continent for its solution, he and Wilberforce being in large part responsible for the abolition of the slave-trade in England in 1807, and for its condemnation at the Congress of Vienna, 1815. He attended the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818, in behalf of the anti-slavery and peace causes. Clarkson wrote a peace tract which ran through seven editions, entitled, "An Essay on the Doctrine and Practice of the early Christians, as they Relate to War". Though in close association and sympathy with the Quakers, Clarkson never joined their society.

(126)

Much of the work of William Allen, 1770-1843, in the peace movement has already been described. He was the real moving factor in the founding of the London Society. Allen was prominent in the Society of Friends and active in many good causes. He assisted Wilberforce and Clarkson in their anti-slavery campaign, supported Lancaster and Bell in their educational movement by championing their side in his journal, "The Philanthropist" (1811-17), was associated with Robert Owen in his work for social improvement, founded an industrial school and advocated the abolition of capital punishment, and was prominent in Bible and Tract Societies.

His relationship with Tsar Alexander I of Russia in 1814 has already been noted. Four years later Allen and Stephen Grellet, an American Quaker, toured various Continental Countries, including Russia, where they were cordially received by the Tsar and members of his family. Other such

trips were subsequently made in behalf of religious and humanitarian interests. Allen was a prominent scientist, being a founder of the Pharmaceutical Society, and with Samuel Pepys he established the chemical compound of carbolic acid.

Having traced the course of the peace societies through their period of organization and expansion, one now may turn to the second and more vital phase of the movement -- the period of the Peace Congresses themselves. It is well to investigate the character, personnel, and origin of this new period.

CHAPTER II

CHARACTER, LEADERSHIP AND ORIGIN OF PEACE CONGRESSES.

The period 1813-1843 had developed organized societies, a growing knowledge of and interest in peace principles, and a definite constructive program. The Peace Society Movement therefore was ready for the next great chapter of its development, the International Peace Congress Movement. This was to bring a broader view of the problem of securing world peace, work on an international scale, and actual significant achievement.

The peace movement of the earlier period, in accord with kindred activities of the time, was dominated by the religious and humanitarian motive exclusively, a circumstance which restricted its appeal to a relatively small group. In the new period, however, there was no such uniformity of principles. Cobden lists three different points of view which were represented in the movement during the second period. The group which opposed all war, even in self-defense, was composed chiefly of Quakers, who, in England, continued to constitute the bulk of the membership of the Society. The great triumvirate, Joseph Sturge, Henry Richard, and Elihu Burritt subscribed to this view. Another faction, of which John Bright, though a Quaker, was perhaps the best exponent, opposed war on religious grounds in all cases but in self-defense, and who stressed economic and political arguments. Bright might like-

wise be classed with the third group, in which Richard Cobden was outstanding, which based its opposition to war, almost solely on political and economic grounds. The third group were not strict adherents to the Peace Society nor all of its principles, but they were glad to cooperate with it, inasmuch as they held a general common objective. They constituted the smallest faction of the movement, but were the most potent, being for the most part men of social prominence, including several members of Parliament. They injected into the program of the Society a decidedly more practical spirit. Opponents of the peace party attempted with a great deal of success to stigmatize the entire group as non-resistants, which tended to nullify the influence of such leaders as Cobden and Bright as practical politicians.

A brief discussion of the outstanding leaders of this period will aid a better understanding of their work. The three men who devoted themselves entirely to the operations of the Society and who kept things moving were Joseph Sturge, an English Quaker and philanthropist, Henry Richard, Welsh Congregational minister and secretary of the Society, and Elihu Burritt, "the learned blacksmith" from America.

(1)

Joseph Sturge (1793-1859) was of old Quaker stock. At the age of eighteen when he refused to serve in the militia or send a proxy instead, the Government drove off his sheep. Thus, at an early age, he expressed his opposition to war. In 1818 he engaged in grain trade at Bewdly and soon built up a thriving business. Here another example of his high principles

is seen in his refusal to receive consignments of malting barley because he would receive no profit from drink. He settled in Birmingham in 1822, where he soon became a general favorite. Here he served the city as a town commissioner, and later when a charter was granted in 1835, as alderman.

Sturge, however, was not so occupied with his business that he could not give much of his time to numerous philanthropic causes. He was a great aid to Wilberforce and Clarkson in their anti-slavery agitation. In 1837 he undertook an investigation of the condition of the freed slaves of the British West Indies. On returning home, he published a book in which he exposed deplorable conditions existing there, and thereby he helped to win further reforms. Four years later he made a similar trip to the United States. He was one of the first members of the Anti-Corn Law League and was active in the agitation for the extension of the franchise. He withdrew, however, from the Chartist movement when it became too radical. Temperance was another cause which enlisted his sympathy.

The peace movement, however, commanded his chief interest. As early as 1818, he founded an auxiliary branch of the London Society at Worcester. Nine years later he established another at Birmingham. On his American trip, which was partially in behalf of the cause of peace, Sturge became acquainted with William Jay's plan for arbitration, and on returning to England warmly advocated it there. More than any other person he was responsible for the calling of the first international peace convention at London, 1843. On

four other occasions Sturge rendered signal service for peace. In 1850 he led a private mission to Schleswig-Holstein and Denmark which offered good offices in securing the arbitration of a controversy which threatened the peace of Europe. In the dead of the winter of 1854, he headed a deputation which carried a memorial from the Society of Friends in England to Tsar Nicholas I of Russia, pleading for the continuance of peace between the two countries. Following the Crimean war he led a relief mission to Finland where British ships had bombarded the coast, indiscriminately destroying the provisions of the natives. For this act of mercy, Tsar Alexander II sent his personal thanks, and Whittier was inspired by it to write his poem "Conquest of Finland". Sturge was one of the committee of three who laid the principle of arbitration before the plenipotentiaries at the Congress of Paris, 1856, and drew from them the first international pronouncement favoring mediation. On hearing of the Indian Mutiny of 1857, Sturge at sixty-five, feeling that it was not an unprovoked crime, desired to lead a mission of inquiry there, but his health was so shaken that his friends opposed his making the trip. At the time of his death, two years later, he was president of the London Peace Society. Burritt, his co-worker, on hearing of his death, wrote in his journal:

"And now Joseph Sturge is gone! No nation on earth has two such men at once for one generation, and none probably ever will. All nations lose by his death. He was unlike Howard, unlike Clarkson, unlike Wilberforce. His philanthropy was as pure and as large as theirs in every direction. His benevolence was spherical, and always shone in the

full moon....He was the first and foremost in organizing a movement for the abolition of the great barbarism and folly of war....and what he did and endured for this object would make a volume....Who was present on those interesting and important occasions will forget him and the beaming light of his countenance, at the Peace Congresses....?"

Sturge, who was a poor public speaker, realized his limitations in this direction and kept in the background at public demonstrations, but his quiet work behind the scenes had tremendous influence, "and around no one's personal history could the movement be made to revolve with greater propriety than around his. For he was to a large extent its animating spirit."⁽²⁾ Sturge was of active body and mind, and gave to philanthropic causes his time, money and labor unstintingly. His calm courage, cheerfulness, and unselfishness were ever an inspiration to his fellow-workers. "He had the rare and inexpressible valuable power of inspiring undoubting confidence in the purity and simplicity of his own motives which drew men towards him with a sort of instinctive and child-like trust."⁽²⁾ When attending the peace congresses on the continent, even the foreigners crowded around Sturge as a natural leader, "Just as the swarm clusters around the queen bee."⁽²⁾

⁽³⁾
Henry Richard (1812-88) was born in Cardiganshire Wales, the son of a Calvinistic Methodist minister. He received a college education at Highbury Independent College, London. At the time he became secretary of the London Peace Society, May 1848, the cause of peace had not received much of a hearing by the British public, but his advent to leadership marked the beginning of a more aggressive and positive tone in the movement.

This same year he joined with Burritt in promoting the first of the great Continental Peace Congresses at Brussels, and for forty years he continued as a leader in the cause of peace. As secretary of the Society he was editor of the "Herald of Peace", the leading peace journal of the world. Also, for a number of years, he edited the "Morning and Evening Star", founded in 1855, during the Crimean War, for the purpose of diffusing peace principles and other liberal ideas. He possessed considerable literary ability and was the author of several books on war.

Richard instigated the mission to the Congress of Paris, 1856, in behalf of arbitration, and guided its operations. In 1868, he was elected to Parliament from Wales. Five years later his peace efforts there were rewarded when parliament, through his leadership, passed a resolution favoring British communication with foreign powers to further the improvement of international law and the establishment of a permanent system of international arbitration. Britain's action was followed by similar resolutions passed by various continental legislatures, resulting in official recognition of the respectability of arbitration.

Though Henry Richard held the non-resistance principle, he was broadminded and practical, seeking the cooperation of others not willing to go so far. He had excellent organizing ability and management which was a great factor in the successes of the Peace Congresses. Personally, he was of fine appearance and genial temperament, well-educated, and with the

manners of a man of the world, having traveled widely and met the leading men of his day. Henry Richard is a connecting link between the pioneer phase of the peace movement and the new one which developed in the latter part of the Nineteenth Century, which arose after the rise of the war spirit during the '50's and '60's had set back the former.

The American member of the trio was Elihu Burritt (1811-1879), widely known as "the learned blacksmith". His father, a shoemaker with a large family, died when Elihu was but fifteen, and the lad voluntarily apprenticed himself to a blacksmith. Having already received a common school education in his native village, New Britain, Connecticut, Burritt conceived the idea of studying Latin. Aided somewhat by an elder brother, he read various Latin authors until he had made considerable headway with the language. He then turned his attention to Greek. Carrying his Greek grammar in his hat, occasionally he found an opportunity to study it while working at his forge. During one winter he thus read twenty books of the Iliad. Next he took up the study of modern languages; French, Spanish, Italian and German. Thus, in the course of several years, he acquired a reading knowledge of about fifty languages, including, besides those already mentioned; Amharic, Arabic, Basque, Bohemian, Breton-Celtic, Chaldaic, Cornish, Danish, Dutch, Ethiopic, Flemish, Gaelic, Hebrew, Hindustani, Hungarian, Icelandic, Irish, Manx, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Samaritan, Sanskrit, Swedish, Syriac,

Turkish, and Welsh.

Burritt early became interested in writing a "scientific" lecture dealing with the analogies between the anatomy of the Earth and the human body. In the course of this study he became convinced of the inter-dependence of the countries of the earth, and before he had in any way felt the influence of Worcester or Ladd, he developed from it a peace lecture. In 1844, Burritt initiated the publication of a weekly paper, "The Christian Citizen", devoted to peace, temperance, freedom, self-cultivation, and brotherhood. About the same time he developed what he termed the "Olive Leaf Mission". That is, he wrote short articles on peace, and headed each with a dove with an olive leaf in its bill. These he sent to various publications throughout the country and many were printed. Several years later, while working for peace in Europe, he revived this plan on a larger scale, making arrangements with a Parisian newspaper with a circulation of 30,000, to carry monthly about a column and a half of such material at the cost of 100 francs for each insertion. The plan proved very successful and he extended it to publications in Germany, Holland, Denmark, and Italy. The effect of the articles was enhanced by the fact that the subscribers were not informed that the insertion was paid for, thereby creating the impression that the sentiments expressed were those of the editor. To cover the expense of these operations, Burritt, a bachelor, conceived the idea of organizing Olive Leaf Societies among the women of Great Britain, who, up to that time, had been given no special

place in the activity of the Peace Society. Soon over a hundred such societies were in operation and were paying for the whole undertaking, which included olive leaves in seven different languages, inserted monthly in forty different journals. Who can estimate the influence of this ingenious method of Burritt's for propagating peace ideas?

During the controversy between Great Britain and the United States over Oregon, peace men in England developed the plan of sending friendly addresses from British to American towns. Burritt was the American selected to deliver these addresses. This led to his corresponding with certain peace men in England, and resulted, in 1846, in his sailing for Europe. His original intention was to stay there only a few months, but it was more than three years before he returned to America. Upon arriving in England, he and his friends developed an interesting society called "The League of Universal Brotherhood", the purpose of which was to encourage friendly and fraternal feeling between mankind. Membership in the Society was based upon signing a pledge never to serve in war or voluntarily support or sanction it, to join with others "of whatever country, color, or condition", in a League to abolish war, restrictions upon international correspondence and friendly intercourse, and "all institutions and customs which do not recognize and respect the image of God and a human brother in every man, of whatever clime, color, or condition of humanity." Burritt traveled about the country on foot for over a year, addressing audiences, at first in "little upper rooms", but soon,

forced by the size of his audiences, in public halls. His first appearance before a London audience was in November 1846. In the Hall of Commerce he addressed a large audience for two hours concerning his League. When, in reading the pledge, he came to the section dealing with slavery, the whole house broke into thundrous applause. Concerning this, he wrote in his journal, "I sat down amidst such a tempest of cheers as never before greeted an effort of mine on any public occasion." Burritt was assisted in this work by Joseph Sturge. Within a year several thousand in England had signed the pledge, and an equal number in America. An association was formally organized in London, May 1847. This organization on numerous occasions merged its efforts with those of the Peace Society.

International postage in the '40's was almost prohibitive, therefore, in line with his universal brotherhood ideal, Burritt took up a crusade for ocean penny postage. In support of this proposition, during two winters he addressed 150 audiences and caused hundreds of petitions to be sent parliament in its behalf. Burritt's work was supplementary to that of Sir Rowland Hill, who during 1839-40, had influenced the passage of a bill providing for a uniform and cheap postage rate within England.

Burritt first conceived the idea of calling a Continental Peace Congress in 1848, which resulted in the Brussels Congress of that year. He also worked actively with Richard in planning the annual Congresses which followed for the next four years.

Burritt was one of the two originators of the movement which, from a call for a convention of American lawyers and jurists to form an international code association into the International Code Association, developed a world organization with branch societies in nearly all civilized countries, enlisting the most distinguished jurists and publicists of the world.⁽⁶⁾

It must be said that Burritt, though absolutely sincere in his work, was too theoretical and impractical. He was, however, a typical philanthropist and agitator. There can be no doubt that through his writings and speeches he reached millions and influenced many for peace.

After Burritt's death, Henry Richard said of him, "Naturally, perhaps, he was not an orator. His style was too elaborate and literary. He wanted the spontaneity and freedom of a ready speaker, and his voice lacked flexibility and compass. But there was such philanthropic fervor in his spirit, and so much simplicity and earnestness in his manner, that he always carried his audience with him...."⁽⁵⁾

Other leaders of the peace movement who deserve special treatment here are John Bright, Richard Cobden, Charles Sumner, and Amasa Walker.

John Bright, though a Quaker, was not as active in the Peace Congress Movement as Cobden, nor did he adopt the non-resistance principle held by most Quakers. Instead of condemning all war, Bright preferred to meet each war on its own ground and to attack its specific conditions rationally.⁽⁷⁾

In at least two cases he justified one party in fighting back when attacked, never ceasing, however, to condemn the crimes and errors which brought on the controversies. (7) The following statement, taken from his address at the Manchester Peace Conference, 1853, well illustrates his attitude toward war: (7)

"....I shall not read the Sermon on the Mount to men who do not acknowledge its authority, nor shall I insist on my reading of the New Testament to men who take a different view of it; nor shall I ask the members of a Church whose Articles especially justify the bearing of arms to join in any movement which shall be founded upon what are called abstract Christian peace doctrines. But I will argue this question on the ground which our opponents admit, which not professing Christians only, but Mohamedans and heathen and every man of intelligence and common sense and common humanity will admit. I will argue it upon this ground, that war is probably the greatest of all human calamities."

In his speech at the Edinburgh Conference, Bright defined war as "the combination of all the horrors, crimes, and suffer- (7) ings of which human nature is capable." The following excerpts from Bright's Manchester and Edinburgh speeches, respectively, illustrate the type of anti-war arguments which he expressed:

"....I draw no picture of blood and crime, of battles by sea and land; they are common to every war, and nature shudders at the enormities of man; but I see before me a vast commerce collapsed, a mighty industry paralysed, and a people impoverished and exhausted, with ever-increasing burdens and a gathering discontent." (7)

and,

"....War will brutalize our people, increase our taxes, destroy our industry, postpone the promised Parliamentary reform, it may be many years...." (7)

Bright stood with Cobden in opposing Palmerston's aggressive

foreign policy which treated strong countries as enemies and weak ones as inferiors, and stoutly urged non-intervention in the internal affairs of other countries.

In 1857, because of his opposition to the Crimean and Chinese wars, Bright lost his seat in Parliament, receiving from his Manchester constituency the lowest vote polled there. His work as a statesman was invariably directed toward peace, and England's neutrality in the wars of Italian unification, the American Civil War, the Danish War, the Austro-Prussian, and Franco-Prussian wars, indicated that the principles which he and Cobden represented were receiving greater recognition.

Though his private interests suffered from the cotton famine resulting from the American Civil War, Bright justified the Northern cause, and when the Trent Affair threatened to involve England and the United States in war, he wrote a letter to Charles Sumner urging moderation. His letter was read in Lincoln's Cabinet. After the war, Bright held that the claims of the United States for damages for the Alabama depredations were justified, and worked for arbitration in the matter.

In 1868, he accepted a position in the Gladstone Cabinet, where he systematically strove for peace principles, and especially opposed wars of imperialism. In fact, his resignation from the Cabinet was due to the bombardment of Alexandria, which he was unable to condone. Bright's greatest work for peace thus lay outside the realm of the peace society and was of a decidedly practical nature.

Closely associated with Bright in public life was Richard

Cobden. These two men headed the League which opposed the Corn Laws in England, and in 1846, above all others, they were responsible for their repeal. In this work, Cobden was motivated by the desire to further economic inter-dependence among nations, and thereby effect universal and permanent peace.

Note his following statement made in a speech at Wrexham, Wales,
(8)
late in 1850:

"....When I advocated Free Trade, do you suppose that I did not see its relation to the present question, (peace) or that I advocated Free Trade merely because it would give us a little more occupation in this or that pursuit? No, I believe Free Trade would have the tendency to unite mankind in the bonds of peace, and it was that, more than any pecuniary consideration, which sustained and actuated me, as my friends know, in that struggle...."

The sincerity of this statement is established by the following excerpt from a letter written in 1842, four years before the Corn Laws were repealed:

"....It has often been to me a matter of the greatest surprise that the Friends have not taken up the question of Free Trade as the means -- and I believe the only means -- of effecting universal and permanent peace.Free Trade by perfecting the intercourse and securing the dependence of countries one upon another must inevitably snatch the power from the governments to plunge their people into wars. What do you think of changing your plan of a prize essay, from the Corn Law to "Free Trade as the best human means for securing universal and permanent peace"?.... I should like to see the London Friends interested in the question of the Corn Law and Free Trade. They have a good deal of influence over the city moneyed interest which has the ear of the Government." (9)

Cobden was not a sentimentalist in his opposition to war, but derived his view of it from his understanding of the spirit of his age, resulting from the growth of the new world order. War wasted resources which should be spent for con-

structive improvement; it oppressed the people, robbing them of prosperity and happiness. Therefore, the occurrence of war should be rendered impossible. Though he did not go the limit in condemning all war, he did feel that unnecessary war was criminal. He did not expect the immediate approach of the Millennium, but he did feel that the peace principle was true, and, after the people were made to see that their material interests demanded peace, he felt it was sure to triumph. Cobden's appeal was to the reason rather than to sentiment; he convinced rather than persuaded.

The weight of Cobden's name at the International Peace Congresses was indeed a great asset to their success. He attended all but the Brussels Congress of 1848, and at each played a leading part. He especially urged arbitration, proportional disarmament, and the refusal to loan money to nations for war purposes. ⁽¹⁰⁾ Cobden, however, did not endorse the idea of a Congress of Nations, held by so many of the peace men. William Ladd's plan for a Congress of Nations, which was thrice approved in resolutions of the Peace Congresses, provided for the calling of an international Congress which was to draw up a code of international laws and create a court. It did not, however, call for armed force to make its work effective, but depended, instead, upon the force of public opinion. Cobden either misunderstood, or else misrepresented this point in his arbitration speech before the House of Commons, June 12, 1849, in which he said: ⁽¹¹⁾

"....I am no party to the plan which some advocate -- no doubt with the best intentions -- of having

a Congress of nations, with a code of laws -- a supreme court of appeal, with an army to support its decisions. I am no party to any such plan. I believe it might lead to more armed interference than takes place at present...."

(11)

In the same speech, he also said:

"....Whilst I do not agree with those who are in favor of a Congress of nations, I do think that if the larger and more civilized Powers were to enter into (arbitration) treaties of this kind, their decisions would become precedents, and you would in this way, in the course of time, establish a kind of common law amongst nations, which would save the time and trouble of arbitration in each individual case."

It seems inconceivable that Cobden, even though he had not read Ladd's essay which had been widely circulated by the Peace Society, should have been ignorant on this point. In his close association with the peace men who did subscribe to the Ladd plan, surely discussion of it would have set him aright. Perhaps he felt such a Congress would arbitrarily adopt force. The following letter to Joseph Sturge, three days after the speech, throws some light upon the situation:

(12)

"....I am afraid that some of our friends will think I took low ground in the arguments I used in introducing the question to the House -- I did so purposely. No other appeal than that to reason, facts, and the practical experience would have secured me a debate. The disposition of the House was from the first to 'Pooh' the matter as Utopian and impracticable. I felt that my first duty was to make it a practical question...."

"I fear, also, that some of the Peace party who advocate a Congress of Nations to arrange a Supreme Court of Appeals for the settlement of International disputes will be disappointed at my disagreeing with them."

"Whatever may be the future state of the world, I am quite convinced that it would be to the last degree inexpedient to bring the Representatives of the different nations together for the purpose of inducing them to agree to anything. They would be far more likely to sow the seeds of War, than to plant the olive tree throughout Europe."

"I know that many Members came down to the House to oppose me -- upon the assumption that I was going to advocate a Congress of Nations, who went away without voting when they found that my plan merely meant a voluntary pledge of Arbitration...."

It is clear from this letter that Cobden did really oppose a Congress of Nations, and also clear why he expressed himself so forcibly on the matter.

Cobden stoutly opposed the Crimean War, and during an invasion panic, 1859-61, in order to create good feeling between Great Britain and France, Cobden was influential in negotiating a commercial treaty with the latter country, which went far toward accomplishing its objective.

At the graveside of Cobden, Frederick Passy, an eminent French economist and peace man, said: "Cobden has done more for allaying international hatreds, for the extinction of those jealous rivalries which have so often armed people against each other, and for promoting the fundamental interests of humanity, than any of the statesmen who have hitherto taken part in the government of nations."⁽¹³⁾

Prominent among the Americans identified with the cause of peace in this period was Charles Sumner, for many years an important United States Senator from Massachusetts. It is interesting that he scored his first great triumph as an orator in an address on peace. Patriotic Boston in Sumner's day annually celebrated the Fourth of July with great public exercises. The chief event of the day was a patriotic oration, concerning which John Adams in 1816, said, "There are few men of consequence among us who did not commence their career by

(14)
 delivering it." Customarily the speech extolled the deeds of the Fathers, stressed civic duty or pointed out dangers to society. The three addresses immediately preceeding that of the year 1845, were delivered by Horace Mann, who spoke on popular education, and by Charles Francis Adams and Peleg W. Chandler who chose historical subjects. In 1845, Charles Sumner, a promising young lawyer, but of scarcely even local importance, was selected to deliver the annual oration. For three-quarters of a century the addresses had been confined largely to conventional topics and stereotyped ideas. Sumner's speech came as a thunder bolt.

Before an audience of 2,000, with at least a hundred gaudily bedecked military guests of the United States Army and Navy and the Massachusetts state militia, Sumner delivered with remarkable eloquence a two-hour address on "The True Grandeur of Nations". His principal thesis announced early in the speech was, "In our age there can be no peace that is not honorable; there can be no war that is not dishonorable".⁽¹⁵⁾ The military guests listened attentively while the orator proceeded to denounce the futility of war. He denied that under moral law States had rights denied individuals. Especially effective was his denunciation of the expenditure of money for war purposes and his insistence that it should be put to constructive ends. He compared the cost of the Battleship Ohio which lay in Boston harbor, decked in flags, with Harvard College, and then exclaimed, "Choose ye, my fellow-citizens of a Christian State, between the two caskets, -- that wherein

is the loveliness of knowledge and truth, or that which contains the carrion of death!"

At one point in the oration a high officer of the State militia who felt officially attacked and personally abused by Sumner's strong utterances, suggested to Henry K. Oliver, Adjutant General of Massachusetts that they leave the hall. Oliver, however, felt such conduct would indicate poor taste as guests and poor soldiery as well, if they would not with-
(16)
stand the fire of an orator.

In answer to his own question, Sumner declared,

"....The true greatness of a nation cannot be in triumphs of intellect alone. Literature and art may widen the sphere of influence; they may adorn it; but they are in their nature but accessories. The true grandeur of humanity is in moral elevation, sustained, enlightened, and decorated by the intellect of man. The truest tokens of this grandeur in a State are the diffusion of the greatest happiness among the greatest number, and that passionless godlike Justice which controls the relations of the State to other States and to all the people who are committed to its charge...."(16)

He closed with this spirited passage,

"....History dwells with fondness on the reverent homage that was bestowed by massacring soldiers on the spot occupied by the Sepulchre of the Lord. Vain man! to restrain his regard to a few feet of sacred mould! The whole earth is the Sepulchre of the Lord; nor can any righteous man profane any part thereof. Let us recognize this truth; and now, on this Sabbath of our country, lay a new stone in the grand Temple of Universal Peace, whose dome shall be as lofty as the firmament of Heaven, as broad and comprehensive as the earth itself."

Perhaps never before had a Fourth of July oration so stirred Boston. For some time it was the main topic of conversation and the press. After some revision, the oration was published and within a short time several thousand copies were

distributed. Its appearance was especially timely, inasmuch as the Oregon controversy with Great Britain was then at its height. Newspapers throughout the country reprinted extracts from the oration, and for months letters of praise and condemnation from prominent individuals throughout the country poured in upon its author. Not until the first of December did the oration reach England, where, in the following month, 7,000 copies were published by the Peace Societies. In May a Fleet Street publisher issued 2,000 copies of the address in a small volume. Numerous other editions appeared. William Chambers, an Edinburgh publisher, said of it in his journal, "The Oration of Mr. Sumner for taste, eloquence, and scholarship, as well as for fearless intrepidity, has been rarely equalled in modern languages." (16) An English correspondent of the "Boston Atlas" wrote in June 1846, "Mr. Sumner's Oration.....has been published here in five or six different forms. Three large editions of the shilling forms have been disposed of, and the other day I saw a man near the Royal Exchange with what he declared to be 'Sumner's speech against war with England', (16) and his cheap edition sold off rapidly at a half-penny each."

This speech was of the utmost importance in the career of Sumner, for it raised him at once from an obscure Boston attorney to national and international recognition. (16)

In another address, "The War System of the Commonwealth of Nations", delivered before the annual meeting of the American Peace Society at Boston in 1849, Sumner proposed the substitution of a Congress of Nations and arbitration for the

(17)
 custom of war. The following year, he wrote for the Peace Congress Committee an address to the American people, recommending these substitutes.

Sumner's interest in arbitration, and peace principles generally, continued until his death in 1874. Two years before, he introduced a resolution in the United States Senate favoring "arbitration as a substitute for war in determining the differences between nations", and though he was not successful in securing its passage, his efforts were rewarded shortly after his death by both the House of Representatives and Senate passing resolutions expressing sentiment favoring arbitration. In his will, Sumner bequeathed to Harvard College \$1000.00 to endow an annual prize for the best essay by any student of the college on universal peace.

Amasa Walker of Boston, best known perhaps as a political economist, but also prominent as an abolitionist leader and member of the Free Soil Party, was a very active member of the American Peace Society. At the London Convention of 1843, and again at the Paris Congress of 1849, in able speeches he advocated arbitration and a Congress of Nations. He was a practical peace man, and served not only in both houses of the Massachusetts Legislature, but in the United States House of Representatives as well. For seven years, Walker was Professor of Political Economy at Oberlin College, a center of liberalism in Ohio.

A Belgian who took an active part in all the Peace Congresses, and who, because of his social prominence was able to

(21)

do much for the cause of his own country, was Auguste Visschers. He was well versed in matters of administration and legislation, having held positions in the Belgian ministry, and having been the author of numerous enlightened laws, such as one dealing with the relief of railway employees. Visschers was a member of several learned societies, and was the founder of numerous workingmen's societies. (21)

Emile Girardin, an economist and the editor of "La Presse", was one of the peace movement's staunchest allies in France. Here also were Victor Hugo, Joseph Garnier, Frederic Bouvet, Michel Chevalier, and M. Cormenin. In Germany, where fewer leaders can be cited, Herr Bodenstedt of Berlin and Dr. Verrentrapp, M.D., of Frankfort, were outstanding. Several members of the British Parliament actively supported the peace cause, prominent ones being Edward Miall, editor of "The Nonconformist", Henry Vincent, a prominent Chartist leader, Charles Hindley, and William Ewart. Such were the initiators of the Peace Congress Movement. It is next to be seen how the movement was launched.

Since 1840 international meetings of private associations have been held in increasing numbers, but prior to that date there were very few, indeed. To illustrate this rapid increase, the decade 1840-1849 saw only ten such meetings, while in the four-year period 1910-1914, there were 458. (22) It is evident, therefore, that a world-wide conference of a private nature before the middle of the Nineteenth Century was something of a rarity.

The first world peace convention was very likely suggested by the anti-slavery convention held in London, June 1840, which was a great success, inasmuch as it organized the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. Since the leaders of the peace and anti-slavery movements were to a great extent identical, it seems natural, having successfully held a world convention for the one cause, that the leaders should have adopted the same method for the other. Furthermore, a second anti-slavery convention was held in London in 1843, immediately preceeding the first international peace convention.

The first suggestion of a peace convention came from Joseph Sturge, who had figured prominently in convoking the (23) slavery convention in 1840. Under date of February 9, 1841, Sturge wrote his friend, John Greenleaf Whittier, announcing his intention of visiting America and requesting Whittier's services as a traveling companion during his stay here. His objects were to promote "coöperation between the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery and the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Societies, to ascertain the feeling of the Americans in regard to calling another slavery convention, and to seek to remove the objections of the American Friends which had till then prevented their taking part in the anti-slavery societies. In addition, he said, "I mean also to take the opportunity of ascertaining.....what elements there are in America for holding at a future period a conference of nations for the promotion of permanent and universal peace." This was influenced by a desire to secure closer coöperation between the friends

of peace on both sides of the Atlantic at a time when political relations between Great Britain and the United States were assuming a threatening aspect, and also the desire to call the attention of the world to the evils of war in a more effective way than ever before, and to secure, if possible, the adoption of measures to prevent it. Characteristic of Sturge, he desired to avoid appearing or speaking in public, preferring to work quietly through private visits to influential and dependable individuals. Feeling that Whittier might not be inclined to accept his invitation, Sturge said, in closing, "and if our friends there should unite in the opinion that it will be desirable for thee to accompany me, thou wilt feel it a duty from which thou canst not feel excused."

Arriving at New York, April 4, Sturge was met by Lewis Tappan, and soon afterward had received Whittier's promise to accompany him on his tour as far as his health would permit. Sturge proceeded to Philadelphia, and thence to Burlington, (24) where he took up quarters at Stephen Grellet's. Though he worked several months in America in the interest of the slave, he did not forget to inquire concerning American sentiment toward a peace convention. In order that he might meet the American peace leaders, a meeting of the American Society was called (25) at Boston, July 29, 1841, at which most of the active members were present. Amasa Walker presided. Sturge in an address "suggested the expediency of calling at some future time a convention of the friends of peace of the different nations, to deliberate upon the best method of settling international

disputes". Several spoke favorably on the proposition, and a resolution was unanimously adopted recommending the calling of "a general conference of the friends of peace at the earliest practicable opportunity in London, to consult on the measures that are best adapted to promote universal peace among the nations of the earth." Details concerning the meeting were left to the London Society. A second resolution approved the new Jay plan of stipulated arbitration and recommended that friends of peace petition their governments in its behalf.

On returning to England toward the close of August, Sturge on September 15, met the Executive Committee of the London Peace Society in a session called especially to consider the resolutions adopted by the American Society. ⁽²⁶⁾ It was resolved that the Jay plan was "a sound practical measure, entirely harmonizing with the principles of the Peace Society, and the general adoption of which would be a blessing to the world". Another resolution approved the proposed convention, "to be held at an early opportunity". Two days later there was a second meeting to adopt the necessary measures to carry the resolutions into effect. Here it was resolved that because of the lack of an official communication from the American Peace Society in regard to the Jay proposal they were unable to recognize it as their "united act", but expressed the desire to coöperate with the American Society on the subject. They also decided that a meeting should be held February 16, 1842, to decide on the details of the con-

vention were held, no one taking part in its deliberations should advance ideas contrary to the principle of the London Society, "that all war is opposed to the spirit and precepts of Christianity". For some unknown reason the meeting set for February 16 did not materialize, but early in May five or six hundred letters were sent by the Society to persons friendly to the cause announcing a meeting at London on May 14, for the same purposes. (27) At this meeting, John Lee, LL.D., F.R.S., presided. Concerning the expense of the proposed meeting, Sturge felt that it need not be great, especially if held the same time as the Anti-Slavery Convention, and suggested that all delegates defray their own expenses. Dr. Bowring, M.P., who denounced the Afghan and Chinese Wars and advocated Free Trade as conducive to world peace, favored a convention, which, he felt, would call public attention to the question of peace. Another declared that no European Court had escaped the influence of the Anti-Slavery Convention of 1840, and that the proposed convention would accomplish for peace similar recognition. A sensible view was expressed by Rev. John Burnet, who felt it was desirable to excite the public mind with the idea of peace, and even though war could not be abolished in their day, it might come about in the next generation. Favorable opinions also were given by William Allen and William Alexander, the latter urging the adoption of a bold course by making it a world-wide convention. Richard Cobden, M.P., declared it was the only way to bring the principles of the Society before the world. Joseph Sturge then moved the

resolution that a convention be called, and there was scarcely a dissenting vote. A member of the French Society of Christian Morals, who chanced to be present, expressed the sentiments that it was especially fitting that a warlike nation like Great Britain should call the world's first peace convention. Following this, Cobden, who was anxious to secure the support of the Peace Society for free-trade, spoke at some length upon its relation to the question of peace. A special committee was appointed to assist the Executive Committee of the Peace Society in arranging the details of the convention, and Rev. James Hargreaves, in closing, made a speech "marked by a spirit of Christian benevolence and love". His speech well expressed the spirit that had dominated the peace movement up to that time; now a change was at hand. The "spirit of Christian benevolence and love" was to be retained at the peace congresses, but as a background for proceedings of a more secular character. The meeting of May 14 was of prime importance to the first organized movement for world peace, inasmuch as it made the final decision which ushered in the Peace Congress phase, the second and more practical stage of its work.

The Committee on Preparations met May 17 to draw up a constitution and plan of procedure for the Convention. (28) According to this constitution membership was restricted to the officers and the Committee of the London Society, to persons nominated by peace societies and associations anywhere, by religious bodies or societies, and by philanthropic, literary or scientific institutions. Public meetings of towns or other

local districts might choose delegates, and the London Committee reserved the right to select still others. The underlying principle of the Convention was declared in these words, "That war is inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity, and the true interests of mankind". Note that the word "precepts" which appeared in a resolution of the meeting of September 17 is not included here. The object of the Convention, as first defined by the conference of May 14, and now repeated, was "to deliberate upon the best means, under the Divine blessing, to show the world the evil inexpediency of the spirit and practice of war, and to promote permanent and universal peace". No discussion of the fundamental principle was to be allowed, and original papers, propositions and resolutions were to be submitted in writing to the secretaries of the meeting before presentation.

On February 23, 1843, John Jefferson, Secretary of the Executive Committee, issued the circular letter of the Convention Committee, announcing the Convention which was to begin June 22, and not continue more than three days. The letter stated, it "will be held in the same place" as "the Anti-Slavery Convention which" it "will immediately follow, in Freemasons' Hall". Just at the time of arranging for the Convention, Rev. Nun Morgan Harry, Secretary of the London Peace Society, died, and the responsibility fell almost entirely to Joseph Sturge. (29)

In the spring of 1843, Mr. Rigaud, an agent of the Society, made a three-months' tour of Belgium and France to arouse interest there in the Convention. At Vaux Hall in Brussels, (31)

early in April, he held a public meeting at which he succeeded in forming a Peace Committee. Another was organized at Mons. Somewhat later he addressed the Council of the Society of Christian Morals at Paris, whose president, the Marquis de la Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, accepted his invitation to attend the London Convention. Rigaud circulated an address and prospectus of the Peace Convention throughout every department of France, and also sent copies to correspondents in Switzerland, Germany, Belgium, Holland, and Sweden. Also, the program of the Convention was sent to the principal continental journals. Thus, the stage was set for the opening of the first peace convention.

CHAPTER III

THE PEACE CONGRESSES.

The London Convention, 1843:

How many of those who read the papers and walked the streets of London on the 22nd day of June, 1843, realized that there was being quietly inaugurated that day a movement which was to have a great influence upon the history of the time? It was the opening day of the first peace convention. At the appointed time and place, the London Convention sat, with (1) 150 regularly appointed delegates and many visitors. Three hundred and thirty-four delegates had actually been appointed, including 292 from the United Kingdom, twenty-six from the United States, and six from the Continent; thus, the Convention was predominantly English. Prominent individuals in attendance were, for Great Britain, John Lee, LL.D., F.R.S., Charles Hindley, M.P., Joseph Brotherton, M.P., John Jefferson, Joseph T. Price, Joseph Sturge, John Burnet, Rev. James Hargreaves, Samuel Bowly, and William Forster. Among the Americans were Amasa Walker, Rev. G. C. Beckwith, Secretary of the American Peace Society, Thomas Cock, M.D., Rev. Amos A. Phelps, John Tappan, and Lewis Tappan. The Marquis de la Rochefoucauld-Liancourt and George M. Gibbes attended from France. Charles Hindley, M.P., was unanimously elected president of the meeting.

The organization having been completed, Rev. John Burnet

opened the proceedings by reading a paper prepared by himself on "The Essential Sinfulness of War, and Its Direct Opposition to the Spirit and Precepts of Christianity, the Prosperity of Nations, and the True Interests of Mankind". He attempted rather lamely to harmonize the peace principles with the Old Testament and stated that "the Jews were employed by God to inflict punitive justice upon the Canaanites, but that they were not engaged in war with them, according to the ordinary use of the term war". After dwelling on the awfulness of war, he then discussed its inexpediency. The paper pointed out the difficulties of the peace movement due to men's prejudices, and closed with an appeal for the extinguishing of war. Following this, Rev. James Hargreaves spoke at length on the inconsistency of war with Christian principles, and several others expressed like sentiments.

At the opening of the second session of the first day, William Sherman Crawford, M.P., denounced the Chinese and Afghan wars, then in progress, as unchristian and moved a denunciatory resolution, which after considerable discussion, passed with only one dissenting vote, and it because the voter was opposed to the appeal to Government contained in the resolution. John Allen next presented a mass of statistical information concerning war, but read only a condensed view of a portion relating to Austria, Great Britain and France. The reading of some papers on the moral state of the army and navy then followed.

The Friday morning session opened with an able speech by

Joseph Brotherton on arbitration. He reasoned that it is as just that nations resort to arbitration as individuals, and in speaking of the wisdom of such a course he said that nations should adopt it,

"....before incurring all the expense, and the loss of human life, instead of exhausting each other's resources, and shedding the blood of their fellow-creatures...."(1)

Other noteworthy parts of the speech were,

"....Now, as individuals are dependent upon each other, so I conceive nations to be; and one great means of peace, I conceive, is by promoting free intercourse between nations....The interests of peace and commerce are mutually dependent upon each other;.....War is contrary to the laws of God and no human sovereign can abrogate the Divine laws.....I believe that the moral power of England is stronger than its physical power. I believe that principles are stronger than armies."

The Marquis de la Rochefoucauld-Liancourt explained the operations of the Society of Christian Morals in France, and moved a resolution based upon the Jay plan,

"that the Committee of Arrangements be requested to draw up an address to be sent from this Convention to all the governments of the civilized world, including a recommendation that they should introduce into their treaties with other nations, a clause binding the parties to refer all cases of international difference to the decision of one or more friendly powers."

No votes were cast in opposition, although two delegates at this point asked that their names be withdrawn from the Convention inasmuch as they opposed an appeal to government.

Another paper, on "The Best Practical Means of Carrying out Those Principles, and also Particularly to Notice the Suggestions which Have Been Laid Before the Public by Judge Jay, and the Late William Ladd, Esq., and State Any Facts by which These Suggestions May be Supported or Otherwise", pre-

pared by Mr. H. T. J. Macnamara, was read by him. Macnamara believed the only means the friends of peace had for attaining success was favorable public opinion, and suggested several ways of exciting it. He held Jay's proposal was simple, practical, and successful when tried, and felt it would ultimately lead to the adoption of Ladd's plan for a Congress and Court of Nations. Until such machinery were adopted, Macnamara felt efforts should be made to reform international law and that petitions should be used to prevent war when it threatened. Everything tending to encourage the war spirit should be decried, and the repeal of laws compelling military service and the removal of restrictions on commerce should be sought. The paper closed with an appeal for immediate and persevering action. At the close of the session a resolution condemning the British Opium Trade with China, moved by Lewis Tappan, was carried.

The third paper of the Convention, "An Address to Christian Ministers, Teachers in Colleges and Schools, and the Professors of Christianity Generally", by Rev. J. Pye Smith, was read by John Jefferson. It traced the history of peace principles throughout the ages, denounced war as including every sin, and called upon the various groups included in the title of the paper to aid in the cause of peace. William Forster spoke on the inconsistency of Christian parents educating their children for military or naval warfare, and his opinions were subsequently reaffirmed by Lewis Tappan. Forster was requested to draw up two resolutions, one dealing with the military education of children, the other with Christian

men who made the manufacture or sale of arms their means of livelihood. Both resolutions were later adopted. Another paper, on "Preparation for War", by Joshua P. Blanchard, an American, was read by Rev. George Beckwith. It replied to the hackneyed maxim, "to preserve peace, a nation must prepare for war".

Joseph Sturge in the morning meeting of the third day brought up an address which was to be forwarded to the Governments of the civilized world. It contained the sentiment that such an immoral and unchristian custom as war could only be accounted for by human depravity, wrong education, and custom, and appealed to those in power to abolish the scourge by stipulated arbitration. This address was unanimously adopted.

A series of resolutions presented and passed at the close of the last session of the Convention included the following;

"That this Convention earnestly recommends to governments, members of legislative bodies, and public functionaries, the adoption of the principles of ARBITRATION for the adjustment of all international differences; and that stipulations be introduced into all international treaties, to provide for this mode of adjustment, whereby recourse to war may be entirely avoided between such nations as shall agree to abide by such stipulation."

"That while recommending the plan of Judge Jay, which proposes that nations should enter into treaty stipulations to refer their differences to the arbitration of a friendly power, as a measure the most immediately available for the prevention of war, we still regard, as Peace societies have from their origin regarded, and as especially set forth by the late William Ladd, Esq., a CONGRESS of NATIONS, to interpret and apply that law for the settlement of all national disputes, -- should be kept in view by the friends of peace, and urged upon the governments as one of the best practical modes of settling peacefully and satisfactorily such international disputes."

Other resolutions favored the diffusion of peace propaganda among all classes, the further organization of peace societies, the preparation of suitable peace literature for children, the observance of temperance, and the "unrestricted interchange of....legitimate productions". The action of the peace societies in case of threatened war was the subject of another, as follows,

"That whenever any symptoms of the approach of war, in which the countries here represented in this Convention are likely to be engaged, arise, the committees of the Peace Societies in the several countries should call upon their friends throughout the country, to awaken the public attention to the subject; and, without waiting for the actual declaration of war, and regardless of all political considerations or suspicions, to enter their firm but respectful protest against such threatened war -- whatever may be its pretest, or whoever may be its advocates and supporters -- in such a manner as may appear to them best calculated to secure the preservation of peace."

Following the Convention a public meeting was held in Exeter Hall, at which were passed a resolution denouncing the Chinese War and the Opium Traffic, and others favoring arbitration and the cooperation of all Christians in the peace cause.

It is interesting to note here some of the press comment concerning the world's first international peace convention. Opinions pro and con of varying degrees of intensity were expressed. It is of some significance that the "London Times", though hostile deigned to print a lengthy article on the proceedings, from which the following excerpts are taken,

"We have often commented on the fanaticism of association, as a distinguishing characteristic of the social eccentricities of modern times; but of all the developments of this disease which it has ever been our lot to

handle, there is not one which can bear an instant's comparison with the vagaries and delusions of those unhappy individuals who have just been figuring before the world (in our columns) under the title of "The Universal Peace Convention"....."The 'Convention' professes no less than the total abolition throughout the terrestrial globe, of war....Sufficiently extensive this, certainly; and how do our readers suppose that it is all to be brought about? By uniting some half-dozen Whig members of Parliament, a score or two of Quakers, a few hundred less prominent Englishmen, and a scattering of not very influential foreigners...."(2)

The Morning Advertiser was much more favorable,

"....It was something new to witness a great number of respectable individuals, including several of the senators of the land, assembled in the metropolis of a country which has been in the habit of boasting of its 'military glory', with the express view of promoting the principles of permanent and universal peace. It was the first meeting of the kind; it will not be the last....The principles of the Peace Society are making rapid progress in every civilized land, and there can be no question that they will go on achieving fresh triumphs every day...."(2)

The Pictorial Times was still more optimistic,

"....The members of the Convention....will be considered as good-natured, well-meaning enthusiasts -- harmless madmen, who may be allowed to go at large, and meet and have their small-talk.....The mind of the nation is gradually awakening to the wickedness and absurdity of war; and science, the handmaid of reason, is showing its worse than unprofitableness. Science is bringing nation to nation; and thereby destroying those prejudices, the growth of separation and ignorance....We have ceased, in the pride of our John Bullism, to look upon Frenchmen as somebodies 'little lower' than human, and in their wretchedness wearing wooden shoes, and subsisting on frog soup....The time will come when we shall look upon a Napoleon as we consider the Great Fire or the Great Plague -- a disastrous visitation -- a mortal scourge...."(2)

Following the Congress, deputations presented the "Memorial to the Governments of the Civilized World", adopted by the Convention, to Sir Robert Peel, Prime Minister of Great Britain, and to the Kings of Belgium and France. Peel court-

(3)

ously received a peace deputation July 1, promising to lay the memorial before the other members of the Government, and declaring that the principle of arbitration had been successfully used during the last twenty years. King Leopold I stated to another such group on July 5, that he strongly favored arbitration. King Louis Philippe of France was even more encouraging. He exclaimed to the deputation which waited on him, "Peace is what we all want. Thank God! war now costs too much to be often waged; and I trust the day is coming when we shall get rid of it entirely in the civilized world."⁽³⁾ He considered arbitration an excellent substitute for war and cited successful examples of it. Letters and suitable addresses were sent to all the other important rulers of the world. Also three thousand copies of the resolutions of the Convention were printed and sent to ministers of religion, editors, and friends of the cause. About 1,300 copies of the resolutions on the opium trade and on the Jay plan were sent⁽³⁾ to all the members of Parliament and other public officials.

One sees in the Convention of London a turning point in the peace movement. For the first time the societies on both sides of the Atlantic had officially joined hands and put on a peace demonstration for the world. The result was increased recognition and importance. Perhaps the greatest gain of all was the moral stimulus which came from having held a successful demonstration on a world-wide scale. The members themselves received increased respect for the movement and were inspired to carry on the work with renewed energy. So

gratifying was this first venture that it was decided before adjourning that the London Society should use its discretion in calling another such meeting, though no time limit was set. Since the next congress did not convene until the year 1848, the question arises why was one not called sooner. In this connection it must be remembered that at that time such meetings were rare. It was no easy task to get a respectable delegation from across the Atlantic to attend such meetings every year. Travel was slow and difficult, compared with today, and the trip was relatively more expensive. The Anti-Slavery Societies did not hold annual meetings, their first one being held in 1840, and the second in 1843. Moreover, soon after the London Convention the Oregon controversy arose to disturb the tranquility between the British and American Governments. In this period the peace men in both countries had a great deal to do in combating the war spirit, and no sooner was the Oregon question settled, than the United States was plunged into a war with Mexico. It was not until 1848, therefore, that conditions were again favorable for another Congress. By that time a new and energetic figure had assumed the secretaryship of the London Society, and an enthusiastic agitator from America had gone to England in the interest of peace work. Thus the great triumvirate of the Congress movement, Richard, Burritt, and Sturge, was complete.

The Brussels Congress, 1848:

Numerous attempts had been made to settle the Oregon boundary question during the early decades of the Nineteenth

Century, but not until about 1844 did the question threaten seriously to disturb the peace between Great Britain and the United States. From then until the Oregon Treaty was made, two years later, a great deal of war talk was heard in both countries, and war feeling, especially among certain groups in the United States ran high. This, as noted above, gave the peace men in both countries their first real opportunity to exert their influence in a threatened war, and they cooperated to prevent the break. Joseph Crosfield, a Quaker of Manchester, originated the plan of "Friendly International Addresses", whereby manuscript letters signed by prominent citizens were sent from English to American cities, expressing good will and urging them to use their influence to secure a peaceful settlement of the dispute. These letters were forwarded to Elihu Burritt, who not only distributed them, but had them, together with his own "Olive Leaves", reprinted in American newspapers. In person, he took one letter to Philadelphia and another, from citizens in Edinburgh to Washington, he presented to John C. Calhoun. Thus Burritt was brought into correspondence with the peacemen in England, a circumstance which resulted in his sailing for that country in 1846, leaving "his anvil at home, to teach the nations how to change their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruninghooks". In England he carried on the work of spreading his League of Universal Brotherhood.

(6)
At a conference in Manchester, February 25, 1848, the day following the proclamation of the Second Republic in

France, Burritt and a small group of friends of peace, including Joseph Crosfield, George Bradshaw, and Joseph Sturge, determined ⁽⁷⁾ to hold a small upper-room meeting in Paris, including all interested persons, in order to draw together at that ⁽⁸⁾ unsettled time the forces opposed to war. "At that time," said Burritt, "we dared not aspire to call the proposed meeting ⁽⁷⁾ a Peace Convention, but a Peace Conference."

Early in August, Burritt sent out a circular informing the friends of peace of the proposed convention at Paris, which was to meet about the first of September. The London Peace Society was invited to join in the demonstration, and accepted on condition that the convention met with the approval of the French authorities, that nothing in the proceedings should be inconsistent with the principles of the Peace Society, and that the meeting refrain from interfering with current political questions. Burritt and his friends accepted these conditions without hesitation. On August 14, he went ⁽⁹⁾ to Paris to make the necessary arrangements, and spent several days there, but after investigating the situation he reluctantly decided that Paris was not the proper place for the meeting because of the political excitement continuing from the "terrible June Days", and aroused over the Italian revolts. His next choice was Brussels, where he went late in August and was joined by several Englishmen who came to assist in the preparations. M. Rogier, Belgian Prime Minister was favorably disposed toward the projected meeting and gave them a letter of introduction to M. Auguste Visschers,

Councillor of Mines. Visschers with alacrity agreed to serve as president of a Committee on Preparations. With the help of Burritt and the Englishmen, Visschers' Committee made the preparations, and the three-day Congress opened at Brussels, Wednesday, September 20, 1848, in the Salle de la Societe de la Grand Harmonie, the finest assembly hall in the city. (10) It was appropriately decorated for the occasion. Behind the platform was a statue of Peace, around the base of which were the emblems of Sciences, Arts, Agriculture, and Commerce, all surrounded by evergreen, floral decorations, flags, and the national colors of Belgium. In front was the bust of the King of Belgium, and around the hall were the flags of Holland, Great Britain, France, and the United States, as well as two white flags bearing in gold lettering the names of the London and American Peace Societies.

About 130 men and many women came in a body from Great Britain, comprising the largest delegation which had ever up to that time crossed the Channel to attend such a congress. (11) M. Visschers was elected President of the Congress. Among the other officers were William Ewart and Edmund Fry from England, Francisque Bouvet and M. Bourson from France, Elihu Burritt and Henry Clapp from the United States, while Holland and Belgium were represented by M. Suringar and M. Lehardy de Beaulieu, respectively.

Visschers opened the Congress with a speech explaining the object of peace societies, and giving a brief survey of the movement. A letter from M. Charles de Brouchere, Pres-

ident of a free-trade congress held at Brussels the preceding year, next was read, in which the writer connected the two movements and expressed hope for a successful meeting. A paper by Edmund Fry on "The Inequity, Inhumanity, and Absurdity of War, as a Means of Solving Differences Between Nations", was now presented. It closed with an appeal to the nations of Europe and America to join in overthrowing war,

"....Let them resolve that the calm dignity of justice shall supersede the remorseless tyranny of the sword; and in the name of common humanity, let them plead against any further appeal to the battlefield. Then nations will be honourable and happy, -- just and respected, -- righteous and secure, -- and then war shall be no more!" (10)

An excellent address on arbitration, thoroughly practical in spirit, was delivered by Francisque Bouvet, a member of the French National Assembly. Some passages from his speech follow:

"....That which reason and morality demand, the material interests of the world enforce with the most urgent necessity. Who does not see that commercial transactions are now so spread abroad from one end of the world to another that any commotion instantly affects our national prosperity with chilling fear and the apprehension of impending ruin?...."

He spoke of debt incurred from war and war preparations, and, as a remedy, advocated general disarmament. To continue,

"....The nations at present stand opposite each other in a state of barbarism, without a common jurisdiction, without any bond of association, exposed to the contingencies of war and discord....Form, then, today, and raise over the nations a general law of association, a representative jurisdiction, which may be to them what national constitutions are to the families and provincial divisions of the different kingdoms....These valuable guarantees cannot be secured without constituting a Congress, which might call to its bar the disputes of the different nations with a

view to the general good.....that which morality and religion, by isolating themselves too much from the real affairs of the world, are unable to produce, material necessity will form into a law."

Baron de Reiffenberg, a member of the Royal Academy of Science and Literature of Belgium, expressed the opinion that the day of peace would come, but first moral and religious education must prepare for it. In another speech William Ewart declared, "It is the interest.....I might almost say the duty.....of all nations, to desire the prosperity of all other nations." In discussing the wickedness of war and its inconsistency with Christianity, Henry Richard asserted that the peace societies could prepare men's minds to the point where no government would dare to enter war because of popular opposition. "Above all," he states, "we must exhibit war in its proper colors -- a gigantic murderer, drunk with ambition and lust, and hideously stained with the blood of its myriad victims." A resolution was then adopted condemning war and urging the people of the civilized world to adopt measures to prevent it.

The next topic of discussion was the Jay plan of stipulated arbitration, upon which a paper by William Stokes was read. The author listed seven arguments favoring such a course. Richard Cobden, unable to attend the Brussels Congress, sent a letter instead, which was read at this juncture. In it were stated his views on three points. He strongly approved of arbitration clauses in treaties, but was not prepared to endorse the proposed Congress of Nations until he had more closely examined the idea. He strongly urged general

disarmament among the nations, and discussed at length the situation then existing in Europe. In associating this condition with the recent revolutions in Europe, he said, "This enormous burden must have greatly aggravated the sufferings of the industrial population during the late bad seasons, and may have partly caused their discontent which has so often ended in revolution." After declaring his conviction that "Peace is the law of civilized humanity, M. Roussel, Professor of Law at the University of Brussels, endeavored to prove peace feasible. International contests, he felt, were very much like private quarrels, mostly over property, honor, or dignity, and since the latter were settled by arbitration, he asked why nations did not do likewise.

At this juncture a dissenting voice was raised, setting forth the prevalent popular attitude toward the topic under discussion. This protest is unique among the records of the Peace Congresses, and since it had the desirable effect of bringing the discussions down to earth, it seems regrettable that more men of the de la Sagra type were not present at these meetings. Senor Ramon de la Sagra, a Spanish naturalist and economist, a man of considerable importance, held that armies were absolutely necessary because there were no other supporters of laws, and if it were not for them court decisions would cease to be respected. He further maintained that arbitration as a means of settling disputes was impossible, because it must depend upon force for its accept-

ance, "and what other means can be resorted to than the force of arms?" No one would obey without armies, declared the speaker from absolutist Spain, and, "as for myself, I should be one of the first to send the arbitrators about their business." Laws had formerly been accepted through faith or compulsion, and since faith no longer existed, "anyone who wishes to do away with force is an anarchist." Good Joseph Sturge, ignoring this enfant terrible, expressed his agreement with Cobden's views and sat down. J. S. Buckingham then rose to reply to de la Sagra. He applied the dominion-of-force argument to individual relationships, asking who wished to go back to the feudal period, and then tartly answered his own question by saying, "No one; unless perchance, Mr. Ramon de la Sagra. He insinuated that de la Sagra wished to be thought original, but was behind the times, and closed with the statement, "Gentlemen, if I have succeeded in answering the argument of Mr. de la Sagra, I assure you that I shall sleep better for it tonight, and wake more cheerfully tomorrow morning." M. Hauman challenged Sagra to suggest some means other than arbitration for regulating the world's differences without resorting to war, but the latter, while declaring that he was not an advocate of war, simply reaffirmed his stand that force was necessary to preserve the social order, and if removed, anarchy would result. Sagra's next opponent was S. D'Archy Irvine of Ireland, who denied that faith no longer existed, as Sagra had stated, and advocated the efficacy of public opinion in abolishing

war. John Allen, who disagreed with Sagra, was glad that he had expressed his honest opinion. At the opening of the next session, a resolution favoring the arbitration clause in treaties, passed with only the dissenting votes of Sagra and Suringer, the latter opposing the wording of the resolution.

The next topic of discussion was "the proposition of convoking a Congress of Nations, the object of which shall be to form an International Code, in order, as far as possible, to settle on a satisfactory basis, most questions, and generally to secure Peace". M. Burson read a French translation of a treatise by Burritt on the subject, with no new ideas, but with specific applications. Among other things, the paper stated that, once the plan was adopted, the people would say to their governments, "There is the law; there is the court; there sit the Judges! Refer the case to their arbitrament, and we will abide by their decision". Burritt compared the functioning of the proposed court to the Supreme Court of the United States. His closing appeal follows:

"All the Continental Governments are now undergoing the process of renovation, or reconstruction upon a popular basis. New Freedom of the Press, right of public meeting, of association, and other great popular prerogatives have been acquired. The community of nations is slowly approximating to the condition of the family circle. Now is the time to organize these social tendencies and national affinities into a fixed system of society. Everything favours the proposition. The great obstructions that would have opposed it a year ago, have been removed (by the Revolutions of 1848). Nations are gravitating into union; not giving up any essential qualities of independence or individuality, but confederating with each other under the attraction of mutual affinities. Then, why may we

not link these large circles of humanity into one grand system of Society, by creating for it a common centre and source of attractions in the establishment of a High Court of Nations?"

M. Bertinatti, a juris-consul and author of Turin, in declaring himself for a Congress of Nations, said,

"....Commercial liberty, which is destined to make the circuit of the globe, could scarcely go alone without bringing in its train the political confederation of all nations. The two are as closely connected together as two sisters...."

Henry Vincent felt that public opinion would have to be changed before nations could "settle by argument what" they "could not settle by arms". The Congress now heard from Sagra again, who explained that he meant by his phrase "lack of faith" in his former address, not the creed of an individual, but the social faith in Divine Right, which implied obedience to law because it came from God, and in accordance with which a crime was punished not only on earth, but in the next world as well. "We must then reestablish the double sanction", he declared. Sagra then proceeded to denounce the proposed Congress of Nations and its humanitarian code based on reason, as impossible and absurd, and if such a Congress were held "it would be the source of the most terrible anarchies". It was impossible, according to Sagra, because it must be composed of delegates from all the nations, either appointed by the governments or elected by the people. If appointed by the governments, the representatives were merely ambassadors, and it would result in the establishment of a despotism. The delegates, then, must be nominated by the

people by universal suffrage, because some could not be appointed by absolute monarchs, and others by democratic parliaments, therefore all would have to admit the principle of universal suffrage. Hence the scheme was impossible. The plan, he held was absurd, because its object was to draw up a code of the social order, and he did not believe such a heterogeneous and contradictory congress could unite on a code of peace, especially when such differences existed within the states. He maintained that public opinion was the cause of the anarchy of the day. The plan was anarchical because every law must have sanction or not be respected. The proposed Congress had no real authority to enforce its laws. Differences would arise which would wreck the Congress, and hence produce anarchy.

Mr. Ewart gave Sagra credit for having great talents for discovering defects, and said his ideas were like "chateaux en Espagne". He pointed out that Sagra did not deny the existence of individual belief, and stated that in England acts of Parliament were respected because they were founded on principles in which the people as individuals did believe. Furthermore, Sagra overlooked the force of public opinion which would support such a Congress. Ewart denied the necessity of universal suffrage for the validity of law, though he felt it inevitable that universal suffrage would come to the world. The resolution favoring a Congress of Nations passed with only Sagra opposed.

General disarmament next came up for discussion, and a paper by Stokes on the subject was read. Abbe Louis rose to

declare himself in favor of defensive war, and, rambling from the topic under discussion, began an attack upon Sagra, who protested and demanded the right to reply. The abbe was called to order, but almost at once resumed his attack and was called to order again. M. Roussel felt that the time for universal disarmament had arrived. "An armed Peace! What an idea; we might just as well talk of a living corpse". His speech was a denunciation of Dante's proverb, "if you wish to preserve peace, prepare for war".

Henry Vincent stressed the idea of the brotherhood of peoples and claimed to love humanity more than any country. The following oratorical passage is illustrative of his speech:

"....Let us now, from the centre of your noble city, send forth the streamlets of moral influence which shall one day surround all nations of the universe, and spread peace and harmony in every land. Let us propose this disarmament in all Europe.Welcome here the form of Peace, beautiful in its appearance even as a tender maiden. Garland it with flowers; it will march through the world, though a mere stripling, strong in its moral influence; girt round with the precepts of the Gospel, it shall ever succeed; it shall attract by its own inherent refulgence all that is beautiful and just in the world, and the day shall come when the armies shall fly before the messenger of Peace; the gun shall be spiked with the pen."

General disarmament, in the opinion of Professor Hult of the University of Ghent, was the most practical suggestion which had been made at the Congress. Sagra, then, was refused another hearing by the Congress because of the lateness of the hour. The Congress passed the disarmament resolution and adopted addresses to be presented to the governments and peoples of Europe and America. The memory of William

Ladd was recalled to the Congress by Elihu Burritt in a brief appropriate speech, and the president, in closing, declared, "....I am proud to say that the first stone of the Temple of Peace has been laid by you at Brussels. A public soiree for the delegates was held following the last session of the Congress. Here three prizes were offered for the three best essays on Arbitration, a Congress and Court of Nations, and general disarmament.

The sessions of the Brussels Congress were followed by leading European journals. "Le Moniteur Universel", the official publication of the French Government, daily recorded the proceedings, giving a good account prominently placed in the paper. (13) The "London Times", as usual, was hostile (13) and indulged in sarcasm. Note the following excerpts,

"....Mr. Cobden has been invited, and has declined his personal attendance, wisely preferring the airy beach of Hayling Island, and the scream of the sea-gulls, to a crowd of pacific gentlemen and ladies...."

"....In fact, you find nothing else proposed than what has been proposed, attempted, and generally adopted from the beginning of the world to the present day...."

"....There is a sort of impertinence, therefore, in coming forward just at this moment, and talking as if Peace had never engaged the attention of mankind, and as if several hundred ladies and gentlemen on a pleasure-trip to a petty little capital had the glorious monopoly of its inculcation...."

(13)

The Morning Advertiser, September 26, stated:

"....that the Congress at Brussels will, in all probability, incur the ridicule of their fellow-men, by their efforts to put an end to the unchristian and inhuman practice of settling national disputes by an appeal to arms. Let them not be discouraged on that account. Theirs will only be the fate which has befallen the originators of nearly all the great enterprises of past times...."

The account in "The Express", September 26, in part, ran as follows:
(13)

"....Such meetings,....as that of the philanthropists and political men who constituted the Peace Congress of Brussels are opportune, and may be productive of excellent effect...."

One of the most favorable accounts appeared in "Douglas Jerrold's Weekly Newspaper",
(13)

"....The men of Peace who met at Brussels have -- we say -- afforded great mirth to thousands and the more especially to those impartial roysters who sit at mess-tables....The Peace Society sow the acorns whence, in due season, the nations shall gather their best oaken garlands....opposition, like the wind shaking the sapling, will make it strike the deeper root....Time -- that terrible oldclothesman, with all sorts of purple and ermine in his bag -- deems even the gray coat somewhat out of elbows, and the little cocked hat none the better for its nap. Therefore, if only for a change, let us give a trial to the broad beaver and the drab. Let us promote, if only for a while, Joseph Sturge vice Napoleon, deceased...."

A conservative estimate of the Congress is found in "The Patriot", September 28,
(13)

"....They have been ridiculed, of course, in our War journals; but misrepresentation has been found necessary to give point to the malicious shafts.... For our own part we feel certain, that by its amiable advocates, the Peace Congress of Brussels will be regarded as having seasonably contributed to animate the nations of Europe with pacific dispositions."
(12)

Concerning the Congress, Burritt wrote in his journal that he resolved to continue his work for peace with renewed courage and zeal. Henry Richard called it a "marked and unequivocal success" and noticed a hearty interest which furnished assurance to those present that their exertions will not be allowed to cease with the temporary excitement of the occasion."
(14)

The Congress of Brussels was even a greater success

than its promoters had anticipated. Although it had met as a "conference", the journals gave it the more important name of "congress". It marked the first real invasion of the Continent by the Peace Societies, and succeeded in arousing a great deal of latent interest there. Several able men, notably Visschers, became for the first time active in peace work. Another indication of its great success was that immediately following it three annual Congresses were held. Subscriptions to the Society were greatly increased, and the
(15)
"Herald of Peace" was enlarged.

Following the Congress addresses were sent to the govern-
(16)
ments and peoples of Europe and America. Large public peace demonstrations were held in London, Birmingham, Manchester, Bristol, and Hull. At an enthusiastic meeting in Exeter Hall, London, 5,000 attended, concerning which the "Hull Advertiser" said, "We were present at that meeting, and we can truly affirm that it was one of the finest we ever witness-
(17)
ed". Such success demanded another Congress, and on October 31, a meeting was held at the London Hall of Commerce to consider the calling of another such convention. A resolution by William Ewart calling for a Congress the following year was adopted. Burritt suggested mid-August as the time, which he considered more suitable for Americans than a later date, and it was adopted. Several places were suggested; Berne, Basle, and Hanover, but Charles Hindley's proposal for Paris
(17)
was finally approved. Consequently a Peace Congress Committee

of thirty-two members was appointed to carry out the resolutions and take steps to raise £5,000 to defray the expenses of future Congresses.

This Committee held its first meeting the same day on which it was formed, and at this time it was announced that Cobden had determined to sponsor an arbitration resolution in the House of Commons. For the next several months the energies of the Society were devoted to meetings held in every part of the Kingdom, in order to create public sentiment in support of Cobden. No doubt, the Brussels Congress likewise inspired Bouvet in France, and Tuck in the United States, to similar resolutions in their legislatures.

Soon after the February Revolution (1848) in France, the Executive Committee of the London Peace Society sent to Lamartine, the poet, and a member of the Provisional Government, two addresses, one to the French Government, and another for distribution among the people. In reply, under date of April 24, 1848, Lamartine, expressed "lively sympathy" for the sentiments expressed in the address, and said, "I shall be happy to contribute all in my power to the maintenance (18) and development of universal peace". In the following January, Lacan, a young friend of Burritt's, wrote him a rather effusive letter from Paris concerning an interview which he had recently had with Lamartine. He reported the "poet-hearted Demosthenes" as saying,

"Peace has always been my favorite thought, my most cherished dream; I am the most fervent apostle of Peace!....Peace! it is reason!....Peace! it is of

God.....Tell them (the Peace Congress promoters) to make haste; tell them the Peace Societies ought....to have a delegate in every large town in France charged with organizing meetings.....When Mr. Burritt comes to Paris bring him to me, and above all assure him that universal Peace is my dream and my object....."

This speech, it must be admitted, sounds more like La-
 (18)
 martine the poet than Lamartine the statesman. Others in France at this time were taking a keener interest in pacifism, for early in 1849, a "Society for the Union of the Peoples" was formed under the leadership of Bouvet, the object of which was "Peace, Conciliation, and Brotherhood of all peoples"
 (19)
 ". Shortly afterwards, its name was changed to the "Society of Universal Peace". Among its active members was
 (20)
 M. Zeigler, an eminent French painter.

The decision of the Peace Congress Committee to hold a Congress at Paris in the month of August has been noted. Accordingly, Richard and Burritt were sent there in April to feel out the situation, and if favorable, to take the
 (21)
 steps necessary for convoking the meeting. At Paris they interviewed Lacan, Bouvet, Emile Girardin, perhaps the most powerful journalist of Paris, Athanase Coquerel, a Protestant orator, and Bastiat, a well-known political economist. Girardin willingly agreed to attend the meeting and consented to serve on the organizing committee. Bastiat felt that a reduction in armaments was greatly needed, and warned the leaders against making the Congress an English demonstration, because of the great prejudice existing in France. He, too, consented to serve on the Committee on Organization.

With Visschers who had arrived to help them, Burritt and Richard called on Lamartine at his residence. Lamartine, who no longer held a position in the government, but who still wielded considerable influence, agreed to receive and welcome the foreign delegates of the Congress, to gain the consent of the government for the use of a suitable assembly hall, and to organize the Committee on Preparations. But he refused to act as president of the Congress because "there are certain political considerations which compel me to decline that position". Two or three weeks later Lamartine received Richard, Burritt, and George Sumner, a brother of Charles Sumner, in another interview. The poet appeared very informally, partially deshabille, with his hands in his pockets, and smoking a cigar. Madame Lamartine acted as interpreter. Lamartine was upset by attacks which some of the London papers had made upon him, and it required considerable tact to secure his consent to assist further in the plans for the Peace Congress. At this time his political influence was rapidly waning. Later, after having made promises, he declined to call a meeting of the Organization Committee, and even refused to sign the joint circular of the Congress. Soon afterward, keenly feeling his political failure, he went into retirement.

The agents of the Society received a great deal of encouragement in their work from the Members of the Society of Christian Morals, the Society of Political Economy, and the Society of Charitable Economy, as well as from certain

(22)

journalists and members of the Government. Burritt, Richard, and Sumner waited on de Tocqueville, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, who professed to favor peace, but felt that the day of universal peace was distant. He spoke approvingly of the Brussels Congress and saw no reason why the French Government should refuse to allow the proposed meeting. De Tocqueville warned the deputation concerning the danger of discussing the recent political events in their meeting. If the friends of peace did not receive as much sympathy in France as expected, he felt it was because their proposals were considered impracticable, rather than due to indifference toward peace itself. Other important persons visited were Arago, Carnot, and the abbe Duguerry.

On June 26, 1849, 1,500 circular letters were issued,

(23)

announcing the Paris Congress, and in another letter of July 17, the exact date, August 22-24, was set, and a detailed program was issued. The estimated cost of the trip from England was, first class, £6 10s; second class, £5 10s. This covered all traveling expenses and hotel accommodations in Paris, but not "wines, spirits, etc." In America arrangements were made with a steamship company to make the return trip to Liverpool and back for \$100.00, the trip requiring twenty days going over and twenty to thirty coming back. Other incidental expenses were placed at \$100.00. American peace society officials wrote the London Society, "we are doing what we can to send out a good delegation to the Paris Convention: we expect

(24)

to succeed." The interesting case of Rev. Cyrus Pierce was mentioned, in the "Herald of Peace", at this time. Pierce, who had assisted Horace Mann in the establishing of the Normal School System in Massachusetts, and who was known to be deeply interested in the peace movement, on resigning his position, was presented a purse to cover his expenses at the Peace Congress at Paris. Horace Mann presented the gift. (25)

The final letter of invitation, signed by the Committee of the Peace Congress, included the names of Charles Hindley, M.P., president of the London Peace Society, Augustus Visschers, William Weart, M.P., Richard Cobden, M.P., Edouard Dupectiaux, Henry Richard, Joseph Sturge, Elihu Burritt, M. Berrille, a Representative of the People in the French National Assembly, Francisque Bouvet, another Representative of the People, Carnot, vice-president of the Society of Christian Morals, Michel Chevalier, Professor of Political Economy in the College of France, Cormenin, Councillor of State, Joseph Garnier, editor of the "Economists' Journal", Victor Hugo, Marquis de la Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, president of the Society of Christian Morals, Horace Say, member of the Paris Chamber of Commerce and Councillor of State. Surely it was a group of highly respectable and prominent men. (26)

The third international peace meeting held its session in the Salle St. Cecile in Paris on August 21. A party of about 700 Britishers and Americans crossed the Channel in two steamers hired especially for the occasion. Concerning the personnel of the group, Cobden told Tocqueville that if the

steamers sank with all on board, all the philanthropic enterprises in the United Kingdom would be stopped for a year. All told there were twenty-three delegates from America, including representatives from Massachusetts, Maryland, New York, Wisconsin, Ohio, South Carolina, Connecticut, Canada and Guatemala, and nineteen from Belgium. Great Britain sent 308 delegates and 365 visitors. The French delegation was estimated at about a hundred. About thirty Germans were present.

In a letter to his wife, date August 19, at Paris, Cobden, who had arrived early, remarked as follows concerning the Congress,

"There is every prospect of a large attendance at the Congress, but we shall not shine so brightly as I could wish in French names. Our friends had calculated upon the attraction of Lamartine's name, but they are disappointed. From all accounts he appears to be prostrate in mind, body and estate. We have chosen Victor Hugo for chairman, and he is one of the few first rate men to be had. To my great surprise I find that Horace Say, after signing the circulars inviting the Congress, has gone off to Switzerland with his family.....Bastiat is gone off to Brussels, but I am assured he will come back to the Congress. The good men who have come here from England to make the arrangements are sadly put out in their calculation of French support, by having taken too much to heart all the professions, promises, bows, and compliments, which they met on their first arrival hereNotwithstanding all drawbacks the Congress will do much good." (27)

In his opening address, Victor Hugo, the chairman of the meeting, made what is generally conceded to be one of the best speeches of his life. (28) After declaring the peace idea practical and inevitable, Hugo predicted,

"....A day will come when the only battle-field shall be the market open to commerce and the mind opening to new ideas. A day will come when bullets and shells shall be

replaced by votes, by the universal suffrage of nations, by the venerable arbitration of a great Sovereign Senate, which shall be to Europe what the Parliament is to England, what the Diet is to Germany, what the Legislative Assembly is to France. A day will come when a cannon shall be exhibited in public museums, just as an instrument of torture is now, and people shall be astonished how such a thing could have been.....

"....A day will come when those two immense groups, the United States of America and the united states of Europe shall be seen placed in the presence of each other, extending the hand of fellowship across the ocean, exchanging their produce, their commerce, their industry, their arts, their genius, clearing the earth, peopling the deserts, meliorating creation under the eye of the Creator, and uniting for the good of all, those two irresistible and infinite powers -- the fraternity of men and the power of God...."

In speaking of the world's rapid advancement, he said,

"....At the period in which we live, a year suffices to do the work of a century.....Thanks to railroads, Europe will soon be not of more extent than France was in the middle ages. Thanks to steamships, we traverse the mighty ocean more easily than the Mediterranean was formerly crossed. Before long, men shall traverse the earth, as the gods of Homer did the sky, in three paces! But yet a little time and the electric wire of concord shall encircle the globe and embrace the world...."

Hugo mentioned the long period of peace Europe had enjoyed, and denounced armaments, saying that, had the money been spent constructively

"....The face of the world would have been changed, Isthmuses would have been cut through. Railroads would cover the two continents; the merchant-navy of the globe would have increased a hundred-fold. There could be nowhere barren plains, no moors, nor marshes. Cities would be found where there are only deserts. Ports would be sunk where there are now only rocks. Asia would be rescued to civilization; Africa would be rescued to man; abundance would gush forth on every side from every vein of the earth, at the touch of man, like the living stream from the rock beneath the rod of Moses. Misery would be no longer found; and with misery what do you think would disappear? Revolutions."

He closed with this effective appeal

"....Gentlemen, this is not the first day that man-

kind are on this providential course. In our ancient Europe, England made the first step; and by her example before us now for ages, she declared to the people, 'You are free!' France took the second step, and announced to the peoples, 'You are sovereigns!' Let us now make the third step, and all simultaneously, France, England, Germany, Italy, Europe, America -- let us proclaim to all nations, 'You are brothers!'

Following the president's speech, Visschers made a report on the work that had been done since the preceeding Congress, and among other things announced the prize-winner of the peace essay contest opened at the Brussels Congress. The award went to Louis Bara, whose subject was "C'est de la Maniere dont on s'y prend pour faire une chose, que derive le succes de l'enterprise que l'on a faite". In a book printed in 1852, under the auspices of the Belgian Free Masonry Society, Bara proposed an international order (29) based upon justice. At this time the president announced on behalf of the Society of Christian Morals an offer of a 500 franc medal for the most complete collection of peace sentiments.

An essay on international arbitration by Rev. Dr. Godwin was read, and Rev. John Burnet upheld it in a speech. De Gueralt spoke favorably of the progress of the peace societies. He felt that wars were no longer inspired by a desire to conquer, but for the restoration of nationality, and suggested that the Congress adopt a resolution favoring the principle of neutrality of peoples, to be maintained by the governments by force, and to take the place of the doctrine that peoples belonged to governments.

M. Peut felt that the proceedings of the Congress were not practical enough and suggested several remedies, including a standing Peace Congress Committee to arrange for annual congresses representing all countries. The proposition that all members pledge themselves to forward the principles of the congresses to the greatest possible extent, that a universal language be decided upon, and that each member pay dues of five cents a week to defray expenses. These suggestions were referred to the consideration of a committee.

The Rev. Mr. Mahan of Ohio thought that since the Congress was agreed on the arbitration principle, they should next consider who should act as arbitrator, and he felt that it should be the executive department of a government. He hoped the Congress would adopt such a resolution and submit it to an international congress of executive representatives. Henry Vincent expressed the opinion that matters of detail should be avoided. Such things should be settled in a smaller meeting. He made the point that arbitration should precede rather than follow war. Cobden was of the opinion that it was wiser not to have an arbitral congress or court appointed beforehand, but to call it each time to suit the special occasion. An arbitration resolution was carried unanimously.

General disarmament came up for discussion on the second day. Athanase Coquerel felt that France was the most bellicose of nations and should lead the others in disarming. The necessity and practicality of disarmament was stressed by M. Suringar of Holland. Vincent favored it for financial

reasons principally, but also expressed religious and humanitarian arguments in his speech. He felt that England and France should act jointly in the matter. Jules Avigdor, a banker of Nice, read an address supporting the disarmament resolution. Emile de Girardin contended that France had doubled the size of her armies since 1818. He felt, since France had abandoned her dreams of conquest, that such a large force was only a burden. Should France take the first step toward disarmament others would gladly follow. William Ewart denied the truth of the tradition that France and England were natural enemies. It was hypocritical, Cobden declared, for governments to arm against each other when they professed to be friends, and foolish for them to increase their armaments in equal proportion. He felt it would be difficult to convince professional statesmen of the wisdom of disarming, and contended that "it is time that the people interfered". A resolution favoring disarmament was then adopted. A second resolution, dealing with the encouragement of international communication through postal reform, uniform weights, measures, coinage, etc., was also introduced and adopted.

M. Coquerel read an essay prepared by Burritt on a Congress of Nations, which contained essentially the Ladd plan for a Congress to codify international law and establish a permanent international tribunal. Burritt's optimistic views are well set forth in the following excerpt from his

speech;

".....And when once the idea of war has been displaced in the minds of nations by the idea of a quiet administration of justice and equality, preparations for war and all the policies which it requires and creates will gradually disappear from international society. The nations would soon accustom themselves to refer their cases to this High Court of Appeal with as much confidence as the different states of the American Union now submit their controversies to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States...."

He pointed out the commonest objections to the plan and attempted to answer them. Amasa Walker, a member of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, stated that "the great interest felt by the friends of peace in the United States in a Congress and High Court of Nations.....induces me to.....present.....the views of my constituents on this important proposition." (31) He also advocated the plan of William Ladd, but made a much abler speech than Burritt, decidedly more practical, and more detailed. Walker answered effectively six of the major objections to his plan:

(1) The nations would never bind themselves beforehand to the uncertain legislation of such a congress. Reply: Nations would not need to bind themselves until they knew distinctly the nature of the legislation; (2) The different nations having diverse and conflicting institutions would be prevented from cooperating by their antagonisms and jealousies. Reply: The jurisdiction of the Congress and Court was restricted to specific objects of international concern. Internal interference was forbidden; (3) The tribunal might not be impartial. Reply: The same might be said of all other

courts. This court was to be composed of men of the highest character; (4) The Congress of Nations would involve the creation of a great central power, which might endanger liberties, and might even destroy the independence of the weaker states. Reply: The Congress did not depend upon a centralization of physical force, but of moral power; (5) It was impossible to form a compact which would for any considerable time answer its original purpose, owing to the changing circumstances of nations. Reply: The adoption of amendments was provided for in the plan; (6) Some nations might not come in, thereby defeating the object of such a congress. Reply: The voice of the people must be heard nowadays. Self-interest would compel all to join.

Walker further said,

"....It is not an American idea, though it may be an American movement.....Wherever it may have originated, therefore, it has been universally adopted by the advocates of peace on both sides of the Atlantic.

"Again, sirs, our confidence in the acquiescence of the confederated nations in the decisions of a supreme tribunal is doubtless increased by observing that no military force on the part of the National Government has ever been required, in order to secure obedience to the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.....Our States are bound together by the ties of interest, duty, of self-preservation....

"We know all the difference which exists, we know the sad effects which the institutions of the old world have had upon the people, we realize their depression and their ignorance;.....but, sir, we believe that the people of the old world have common sense, and that alone is necessary, to enable them to see and feel that such a union is most indispensable to their elevation and improvement; that there is no other way by which they can be relieved from the crushing taxation of standing armies and military preparations. We believe, too, that the people have sufficient spirit to demand this great measure, and if they do so will not fail to obtain it."(31)

Dr. Bodenstedt discussed the peace movement in Germany, where considerable interest was beginning to be developed. A Monsieur Billecoq, who claimed to be a diplomatist, insisted that war was inevitable and rambled on at such length that he had to be called to order. Friendship between England and France was the theme of a speech by Charles Hindley. Edward Miall was convinced that the Congress, wherein men met as brothers, was to make the nations brothers. In a badly muddled speech, William W. Brown, an escaped slave from the United States, declared that the dissemination of peace principles would lead to the emancipation of the slaves in America. He felt, evidently, that the peace movement was a sort of panacea. The resolution favoring a Congress of Nations was carried by acclamation.

Cobden was primarily responsible for the next resolution, which took the form of a protest against loans or taxes destined to promote wars of ambition or conquest. In an address on the subject, he appealed to the conscience of money lenders. One interesting statement he made was, "War has become an expensive luxury..... Battles are now decided by artillery, and every discharge of a cannon costs from twelve to fifteen francs; I wish with all my heart it was ten times as much."

M. Feline, while professing peace principles, declared that countries should arm for self-defense. After rambling on and off the subject, he was called to order by the pres-

ident. Girardin took the stand that wars could be prevented by people simply refusing to loan money for the purpose, and the creation of public sentiment against the practice. The anti-war loans resolution was adopted unanimously. Visschers moved that a committee, composed of those who had prepared for the Paris Congress, be constituted in Paris to correspond with the peace societies in England, the United States and Belgium.

The question of slavery was brought up at the close of the meeting by Hon. C. Durkee of Wisconsin. An ex-slave, Rev. J. W. C. Pennington, Presbyterian minister from New York, spoke, expressing the sentiment, as did Brown earlier in the session, that slavery was an element of war. He urged Christians to unite to get rid of it.

The French Government had been very kind and helpful throughout, allowing the peace party to pass from Boulogne without passports or the customary inspection of luggage, and throwing open the various public places to the delegates. Following the meeting a soiree was given by de Tocqueville at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. On the next Monday the fountains of Versailles were displayed as a rare courtesy. Usually they played only four times each year, and then on Sunday, with exceptions being made only for crowned heads, but many of the British and American delegates were opposed to going to see a mere sight on the Sabbath. About 700 comprised the party which went to Versailles. They took lunch

in the Tennis Court, where in a little ceremony Cobden presented to the American delegates New Testaments in French, as a mark of appreciation for their having come from such a distance. Afterwards they saw the water display, concerning which Cobden wrote his wife, "A vast crowd of French people was there and they were exceedingly good humored and polite, but they seemed to be unable to suppress their smiles at the Quakeresses' bonnets".⁽³³⁾ Following the meeting Cobden wrote his wife:

"The meetings of the Congress are over, and I am able to say that it has proved very successful; every day more and more auditors of a highly respectable class, and the last day thousands are said to have gone away without being able to enter. Everybody is astonished that upon such a subject and at the hot season of the year, in Paris, too, a room holding 2,000 persons should be crowded for three days running, upon the same subject.....Everybody has been talking about them during the week, and the subject of peace for the first time had its hearing, even in France...."(27)

In some respects the Congress of Paris was the finest peace demonstration of the series of Congresses. Victor Hugo, a man of world-wide fame, had graced it as its president, giving it his full-hearted support. It was the most cosmopolitan assembly of the series, and was much better attended than the Frankfort Congress which followed a year later. Its chief importance lies in the fact that it was held with success in the city of Paris, and was regarded with interested seriousness. Since many of the continental countries took their cues from Paris, the increased respect for the peace movement was general.

Nearly all the Parisian journals reported the Congress
 sympathetically. ⁽³²⁾ "Le Moniteur Universel", official journal
 of the French Government, devoted to the proceedings of
 Congress from one-half to two-thirds of a column on its front
 page. ⁽³⁴⁾ On the whole, comment in British publications was
 more favorable than for the Brussels Congress. However,
 "Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine", "The Quarterly Review",
 and the "London Times", adopted a sneering attitude. "Black-
 wood's Edinburgh Magazine" was especially spiteful toward
 Cobden, as the following excerpt indicates, ⁽³⁵⁾

"....Still the undaunted Cobden lifts up his
 oracular voice, advocating in turn the extension of
 the suffrage, the abolition of standing armies,
 financial reforms and what not.....on each new attempt,
 the rotten tub on which he stands is either kicked
 from under his feet, or goes crashing down beneath
 the husky orator; up he starts from the mire like a
 new Antaeus, and, without stopping to wipe away the
 unsavory stains from his visage, holds forth upon a
 different text, the paragon of pertinacious preachers
A patriot of this stamp is sure to become a
 nuisance...."

The movement itself also was denounced,

"....for some time past, there has been an attempt
 to preach up a sort of seedy crusade having as its
 ostensible object the universal pacification of man-
 kind.....America sent a new Peter the Hermit in the
 shape of Elihu Burritt...."

It was further suggested that "saintly Victor Hugo, the
 author of Lucretia Borgia, if he wished to lead the peace
 movement, should recognize the idea as being original with
 the Quakers and adopt the "uniform of the corps", treading
 the boulevards of Paris with broad-brimmed hat, etc. Then,
 not satisfied with insult, misrepresentation was resorted to.

The peace advocates were accused of favoring revolutions,

"....Some of them employing terms which we never thought to have heard an Englishman utter, have rather chuchled over the spectacle of nobles, priests and statesmen stabbed, shot down, hewn with axes or torn limb from limb by savages, whose atrocity was not equalled by that of the worst actors of the Early French Revolution, and have not been ashamed to vindicate the authors of each hideous outrage...."

The account also reported that the Peace Congress had been reproduced as a farce in vaudeville at Theatre des Varietes, "with unextinguishable shouts of laughter".

(36)

"The Quarterly Review" made the following comment;

"....Not a single Frenchman of name, weight, or influence in politics, except one very eminent journalist (Girardin) — nor a single man besides ever heard of in society except an eminent poet (Hugo), could be prevailed upon to join this Congress!

"....From other countries there was the same meager attendance. No one had ever heard before of Elihu out of the Old Testament. From Belgium, one respectable, but little-known person attended. England sent one or two worthy Quakers and also some three members of Parliament, of whom two were positively unknown, and the third, Mr. Cobden, more remarkable for the praise bestowed on his ability than for that ability itself, — well enough known as an agitator.

"....The Congress sat three days to hear proposals of absolute impossibility as practical plans...."

Following the Congress, a series of great public meetings were held in the leading English cities to ratify the work of the one at Paris. Six thousand attended at Birmingham, eight thousand at Manchester, and a comparable number at London. Cobden usually presided over these meetings, and was assisted not only by the English peace leaders, but by Say, Bastiat, and Garnier, as well.

(37)

Burritt, for the first time since his arrival in England in 1846, made a visit to the United States, where he delivered

lectures in most of the states of the Union. In March and April of 1850, he was in Washington, D. C., where he conferred with friends of peace, such as Mr. Tuck, who, the year before had introduced a resolution into Congress favoring arbitration, Horace Mann, Judge Allen of Massachusetts, Joshua Giddings of Ohio, and Mr. Julian of Indiana. The last two promised to attend the Frankfort Congress in 1850. Henry Clay received Burritt "with stately urbanity", and while admitting the principle of arbitration to be just, did not feel that in the existing state of society man would abide by the award in the case. Burritt, after leaving Washington, held meetings in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Wheeling, Cincinnati, Louisville, St. Louis, Chicago, Cleveland, and many other cities. He returned to Europe in the Summer of 1850, in time to help Richard and Visschers prepare for the Congress of Frankfort-on-the-Main.

Several German delegates had attended the Paris Congress and had shown an active interest in its proceedings, moreover friends of peace in six different German towns had written congratulatory letters, which were read at the Paris meeting. It was the general opinion at Paris that the next Congress should be an invasion of Germany, and of all German cities the Confederation capital, Frankfort-on-the-Main, because of its central location and historical associations, seemed best suited. The friends of peace at Frankfort, anxious to secure their city as the next meeting place, assured

(38)
the pacifist leaders that a congress would succeed there.

At midsummer, 1850, Burritt and Richard went to Germany via Paris and Brussels, where they stopped off to arouse interest in the next congress. (39) Visschers and William Stokes joined them in Germany to assist in the preparations for the meeting. (40) They received special encouragement and help from Pastor Bonnet of the French Protestant Church and Dr. Varrentrapp, chief medical officer of a large asylum near Frankfort. Consent for the holding of the meeting was readily granted by the German Diet, and a strong Committee on Preparations was formed. It included a Frankfort banker, a Heidelberg professor, the president of a Jewish Industrial College, a member of the Frankfort Senate, a physician, an inspector of a Catholic selekten-schule, and ministers of a French Reformed Church at Frankfort, of a Lutheran and of a German Reformed Church. Professor Mittermayer, a prominent leader of the German Revolution of 1848, was offered the presidency of the meeting. He declined because of his damaged reputation, but offered his personal help. (41)

In order to stimulate German interest in the Congress, the peace agents toured Germany, calling on outstanding persons likely to favor their ideas. Within a few weeks they visited Heidelberg, Worms, Geissen, Hesse-Cassel, Gotha, Erfurt, Weimar, Leipzig, Dresden, Berlin, Hamburg, Nuremberg, Augsburg, Munich, Stuttgart, Cologne, Mannheim, and several cities of less importance. Professor Leibig at

Giessen, who had just written a book on agricultural chemistry in which he had referred to war in its relation to material and commercial interests, promised to attend. On the whole their reception was cordial, but it seemed that most people had gone to the baths to escape the torrid weather. At Berlin they visited Baron von Humboldt, the Prussian statesman, who, though he was pessimistic in regard to the peace movement, said, "My heart is entirely with you". He could not attend because of his age, but agreed to write a sympathetic letter "in which I will make no mention of my objections". At the hotel in Nuremberg the landlord was afraid of a visit from the police when he heard that an address was to be delivered by an apostle of peace, and would not permit the people to enter. There was a feeling in Germany as early as 1850 that national unity could be gained only by fighting it out, and therefore some patriots had no use for peace men. (39)

Two days before the congress met the resolutions to be presented had not yet been drawn up. Some of the peace men who had arrived early held, then, two preliminary meetings for the purpose. There was encountered some difficulty in drawing up the disarmament resolution, inasmuch as most of the Germans felt armies were necessary to preserve order. Richard and Burritt insisted that armament for internal police was meant. Cobden, however, suggested a compromise, which Richard feared would displease the Quaker delegates. (39)

(41)
The Frankfort Congress met for three days, August 22-24,

where the Constituent Parliament of 1848-9 had sat, in St. Paul's Church. Its seating capacity was 3,000. Between five and six hundred delegates and visitors attended, the great majority being English, although several prominent Frenchmen, including Cormenin and Girardin, were present. One very unexpected guest was the Austrian General Haynau, whose atrocities in stamping out the revolt in Lombardy-Venetia the preceding year had won for him from an outraged Europe, the name of "the Austrian butcher" or "General Hyena". Cobden, at the close of the first session, wrote his wife: "Upon the whole, I am very well satisfied with the meeting. We are gaining ground."⁽⁴²⁾ Other important Englishmen in attendance were Charles Hindley, M.P., Joseph Sturge, Lawrence Heyworth, M.P., J. B. Smith, M.P., John Burnet, and Henry Richard. Representatives from twelve of the United States were present, including Rev. Dr. Hitchcock of Massachusetts, Rev. Dr. Hall, an Amersham professor, Professor Cleveland of Philadelphia, John Tappan of Boston, Elihu Burritt. Visschers represented Belgium. The German delegates included Herr Jaup, ex-Prime Minister of Hesse Darmstadt, who served as president of the Congress, M. Bonnet, Dr. Varrentrapp, Dr. Spiess, and Dr. Creizenach. Letters of adherence were received from distinguished men in several countries, including Victor Hugo, Abbe Deguerry, Professor Leibig of Giessen, Professor Charles Biedermann of Leipzig, and the Archbishop of Paris.

Herr Jaup, in opening the assembly, traced the development

of the peace movement, and stressed the point that public opinion must be aroused in its favor. One of the ablest speeches of the whole Congress was made by Cormenin, a part of which follows:

"....While I address this august assembly, I even feel my nationality oozing out.....We are, in fact, only children of one great family of the human race.....If peace is a Utopia, so is religion, so is virtue, so is justice, so is love, so is humanity. Therefore, unless we maintain that religion is infinitely below atheism, virtue below vice, justice beneath inequity, love inferior to hate, I cannot see how it can be maintained that peace is not better than war. But if peace be better than war, I say that it is rational to force peace to put down war. On the other hand, if war be a necessary evil, as some assert, I in turn maintain that there is an evil even yet more necessary than war.....I mean death."(41) And why should not people use half as much exertion to escape war as to escape death?(42)....."The time is come, I think, for it the question of war to be brought before the masses, who pay for it.....If our warlike folks at home will persist in visiting Germany, may they resolve to do so only in their holiday clothes.....nor cross the Rhine except in pleasure-trains."(41)

Emile de Girardin denied that the peace cause was Utopian. He stated that the history of the world divided itself into three parts; first, passion and despotism; second union of the states, solved by the United States; and the third, would be the union of the peoples. The third phase would be accomplished

"....Not more by lessons from the tribune, not more by the oratory of the pulpit, not more by the education of the people, than by science. The art of printing, additional facilities in the mode of travelling, greater intercourse in trade between nations and countries, and a better understanding of each other must expedite liberty and justice....."It is a new policy which science is accomplishing.. It establishes its victory by bringing people together and the moment is approaching when not only nations but the whole world will be united under one idea.....universal fraternity."

On an arbitration resolution now introduced, Visschers, Herr Beck of Darmstadt, Herr Maurer of Frankfort, and Girardin spoke. Professor Cleveland of Philadelphia read an address from the Pennsylvania Peace Society favoring it. Cobden declared,

"....We are tired and disgusted with the old mode of calling in men with swords by their sides and bayonets over their shoulders to decide such matters, which should be left to reason and justice."

He argued further that since arbitration worked satisfactorily in private relations it would be even better suited to international relations. The resolution carried by acclamation.

At the opening of the second day's session a large crowd was clamoring for admission. Hindley, in opening the meeting, moved a resolution calling the attention of the nations to the necessity of a system of international disarmament, "without prejudice to such measures as may be considered necessary for the maintenance of the security of the citizens and of the international tranquility of each state." Rev. Rabbi Stein, in seconding the resolution, made a striking speech:

".....Germany may at this moment have no voice to raise for the aim for which we strive, but do not believe on that account that her sympathies are not with us. Germany, whose fields have been so often heaped up with the bloody bodies of her children.....Germany cheers you on! A people which arms against itself appears to me like a man who plants himself before a mirror and strikes his own reflection....."Let the iron of the hills be no more converted into instruments of murder to divide the people, let it be forged into rails for roads which might connect distant countries...."

Joseph Garnier attacked the idea that one nation can be enriched by the spoils of another, and declared that the wel-

fare of the whole depended upon the welfare of all. The education of youth, he felt, was one cause of war. Rev. Dr. Bullard of Missouri and Emile de Girardin also spoke of disarmament. George Dawson of Birmingham opposed armies as non-productive and mentioned the amount of useful work they could do if they were employed constructively. The moral responsibility of a soldier in killing an enemy was discussed by Dr. Hitchcock, President of Amersham College, and concluded, "Every shot that is fired should be fired under a sense of personal responsibility, and in the view of a future judgment." Cobden submitted statistics on armaments, and denounced diplomacy for not improving conditions. In the course of this speech he cited the arrangement between Great Britain and the United States on the Great Lakes to show the wisdom of reducing military establishments. After some religious arguments on the subject, the vote was taken, and was unanimous in favor of the resolution.

Next the question of war loans came up for discussion, and to this resolution was proposed a rider providing for a permanent committee to examine proposed loans to ascertain whether they were intended for war or peace. But upon examination, it was declared to be unfeasible. Girardin quoted the proverb "Money is the sinews of war", and held that if money for this purpose were refused, war would be impossible. Men who loaned money for war purposes, he felt should be socially disgraced. Zachariae of Stettin, prominent in peace work during the period of the Congress of Vienna, called the attention of the Congress to the influence of the

Zollverein upon the German States in drawing them closer together and making war less possible. He recommended its extension to the whole world. The resolution on war loans passed unanimously.

An Indian chief from America moved a resolution proposing that the Congress recognize the principle of non-intervention and the sole right of every country to regulate its own affairs. At this point a fine tribute was paid the Peace Congress, which is indicative of the increasing respect felt for the peace movement and its principles. Dr. Bodenstein, a man of considerable importance in Berlin, presented to the Congress a petition signed by leading men of the Constitutional Party of Berlin and the ambassador from Schleswig-Holstein to Prussia, asking that it appoint a commission with the object of taking steps to end the quarrel between Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein. Bodenstein urged the appointment of such a committee which could decide the right in the case and announce its decision to the world. He felt that such action of the peace men "could not fail to have a mighty influence upon Europe". Since it was a fixed rule of the Peace Congresses that no current political question could be discussed in their proceedings, the president was forced to call his attention to the fact, and Bodenstein apologized for introducing the subject, insisting that it was not done for selfish motives. Cobden attested the sincerity of the proposal and expressed regret that the Congress could not consider the matter. However, more is to be

heard of this later.

The non-intervention resolution was championed by Girardin, Edward Miall, and Dr. Madonao, a Professor in Cassali, Piedmont. Cobden declared that if Great Britain, France, and the United States joined in abolishing the principle of intervention and kept it for five years, other countries also would abandon it. A Swedish Consul to Cape of Good Hope favored non-intervention, but felt that it would require considerable time to firmly establish it. The resolution passed without opposition.

Burritt next proposed a resolution favoring the convocation of a Congress of "Representatives of States to found a Code of International Law". It will be noted that this is a partial retreat from resolutions of former Congresses favoring a Congress of Nations to create an Arbitral Court and a Code of International Law. Burritt, also, made the principal address on the subject, a part of which follows:

"....The bristling barriers of nationality which once divided and estranged them are gradually disappearing, and they are beginning to fraternize across the boundaries that once made them enemies. The great transactions of nations, the mightiest works of human skill and energy, are becoming international, in origin, operation, and ownership."....He referred to building, railways, and electric telegraph, art, industry, exhibitions, navigation improvements, etc....."These are the material manifestations of that idea of universal brotherhood which is now permeating the popular mind in different countries, and preparing them for that condition promised to mankind in Divine revelation. They are the mechanical efforts of civilization to demonstrate that sublime truth, 'God hath made of one blood all nations of men'".

The opinion that a new state of humanity was approaching was

stated by Lawrence Heywood, M.P., who felt that political systems had often hindered peaceful relations by closing ports, taxing food, restricting commerce, etc. "Let commerce prevail, and war must be at an end".

Following the passage of the Burritt resolution, the subject of duelling was taken up. Many opinions were stated, but the most interesting one was that of Girardin who expressed remorse for having once fought a fatal duel. "If we leave no other trace in Frankfort than that resolution," he said, "we might say we had done enough."

While the Frankfort Congress was not so well attended as the preceeding one at Paris, it represented a decided gain for the peace movement, inasmuch as it broke virgin soil in a country which was militaristic by tradition, and which at that time was particularly so due to the rapidly growing feeling that German unification could be accomplished only by war.

Several of the leading London newspapers continued to ridicule the efforts of the peace men, but, on the other hand, they had their friends among the press. The following statement from the August 31 number of "The Christian Times",
(43)
indicates the expanding influence of the pacifists:

"....A few years ago, scarcely half a dozen persons in Great Britain had ever heard of the famous project of Henri Quatre, to supersede armies by courts of arbitration for nations. Now the Peace Society has an auxiliary in all our towns. The idea of words instead of swords has grown into a theory, to which millions

of thanking, moral, and courageous men, are willing to commit themselves forever. Truly, the progress of an idea is a romantic thing. Within a generation past nearly all men believed in the right of fighting..... We can scarcely conceive of an event of more importance to the real welfare of Germany than the insignificant convention, as the "Times" chooses to consider it, of the firnedes of peace, in Frankfort. Of all lands Germany has been most frequently overridden by the warrior and his masters.....But if the German mind once grasps the idea of pacification for the world, there will be an end of government by dragoons."

An indication of the power of the peace movement is seen in the invitation to the Congress to undertake a settlement of the controversy between Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein. Although the Congress was forbidden by its rules to take official action, as has been seen, directly after its adjournment, Sturge, Burritt, and Frederick Wheeler, undertook a private mission to the quarreling countries to offer their good offices in securing a settlement of the dispute. Their efforts are discussed in a succeeding chapter.

The summer of 1850 saw the establishment of the first
(44)
peace society in Prussia, at Koenigsberg, the birthplace of the philosopher Kant, and the site of the University where he did his great work, and wrote his essay on "Eternal Peace". It was, indeed, an appropriate place for a peace society to start! The prime mover of the group was Dr. Lobeck, and a large proportion of its members were ministers of religion. Dr. Motherby, sent by the Free Protestant Church of Koenigsberg to the Frankfort Congress, returned with great enthusiasm for the cause, and on September 19, Dr. Lobeck, who had for

some time been conferring with various people on the subject, called a public meeting to organize a society. About 500 people attended the first meeting. In his opening speech, Lobeck declared that it was his wish to form a society based on the resolutions agreed to by the peace congresses and to vindicate the former glory of Koenigsberg. Dr. Detroit of the French Reformed Church showed that the principle of peace was Christian, and felt that it could best be popularized by organizing a society for that purpose. A report of the proceedings of the Frankfort Congress was made by Dr. Motherby, who regretted the fact that Germany lagged in the peace movement. At this meeting the society was definitely organized, declaring itself opposed to the employment of arms for the decision of differences. One hundred and twenty members joined at the first meeting, and about seventy more at the second one. Motherby was elected president of the new society, while Dr. Lobeck was made secretary. Neither the Roman Catholic nor Lutheran Churches at Koenigsberg had anything to do with the new society, and it was actually derided by those who felt that force was necessary for securing national unity, but one group attended the meetings regularly. They were the armed police officers!

"....If these men came to take part in the proceedings, we should be highly delighted to see them, and should welcome them to our society. As it is, however, they come as agents of the party whose motto is, 'by the grace of God'; to watch our proceedings in their official capacity, in accordance with Mantuuffel's law with regard to societies.(45) Sitting as they do, armed, by the President, they resemble cherubim endeavoring with their sword of office to

keep the enlightened spirit out of the paradise of peace."

Before the Koenigsberg Peace Society had firmly taken root, it was suppressed by the Government because at one of its meetings an extract from the "Herald of Peace" was read, which the police chose to regard as sufficient proof that the Society was engaged in unlawful correspondence with the London Society. Several of its members who wished to attend the Congress at London in 1851, were refused passports on the ground that members of a "political" society were not entitled to them. This arbitrary action illustrates well the repressive spirit of the Prussian Government during the decade immediately succeeding the Revolution of 1848. But the grievances of the members of the peace society did not end there, unfortunately. Since many of them were not members of the State Church of Prussia, they were annoyed on religious as well as political pretexts, as the following letter from one of them indicates;

"....My companions in the faith and myself are persecuted with the utmost vigor in all parts of Germany; but what we free Protestants now suffer will soon be extended to German Catholics. Our ministers are continually punished with heavy fines for administering baptism, celebrating marriages, funerals, etc. A party of armed police and gend'armes lately entered one of our churches during the celebration of the Confirmation and Communion services, snatched the bread from the mouths, and the cup from the lips of the communicants, and dragged the young girls who had just been confirmed, as prisoners out of the church. The children in our schools have been driven by force from our buildings; and as late as the day before yesterday our asylum for indigent orphans was assailed in this manner. Since we strictly and conscientiously observe the laws, they could have nothing to say against us in a court of law, and are therefore driven to employing unwarranted wanton violence....

"....We will not fail to do all we can to interest the public in this (next) Congress; but at the same time I must tell you that our chief organ, the "Ostpreussischer Volksbote", is persecuted most relentlessly by the police, especially that part which is devoted to the cause of Peace. The whole impression of the last number was seized by the police in the printing-office, without their even assigning a reason for this arbitrary proceeding. This number contained a translation of one of your excellent articles. So you see that it is difficult to bring our articles before the public."
(48)

However, Dr. Creizenach, at the London Congress in 1851, stated that the cause of peace was making great headway in other parts of Germany. The "Kölnische Zeitung" of Cologne, the "Allgemeine Zeitung of Augsburg, and the "Weser-Zeitung", three leading newspapers, had received peace articles and have been very favorable toward the movement. He also announced that between 1200 and 1500 copies of the proceedings of the Frankfort Congress had been sold.

It was also in the period following the Frankfort Congress that Senator Henry Stuart Foote reported a resolution in the United States Senate favoring arbitration clauses in treaties with other nations. The proposition had received the unanimous (49) adherence of the Foreign Relations Committee. No Senate action, however, was taken on the resolution.

It was agreed at Frankfort that the next Congress should be held at London the following year where at that time there was to be held the great Crystal Palace Exhibition of the Industries of all nations, the very purpose of which, to quote the Prince Consort, was, "to strengthen the bonds of peace and friendship among all the nations of the earth". (50) Such an occasion in that day was indeed rare, and the suspicions of

ignorant and prejudiced people gave vent to many prophecies of evils, such as conspiracies, revolutions, nationalistic quarrels, and religious strife, which would surely result from allowing large numbers of foreigners to visit the country. (51) The fact is that the result was quite the opposite. The spirit of peace seemed to permeate the very atmosphere. Seldom had peace sentiment been so rampant. Sir John Herschel gave the name "Irene" (Greek word for peace) to a new comet which appeared at this time. Richard and his colleagues urged the Royal Commissioners in charge of the exhibition to award no prizes for instruments of war, and none were. The anti-slavery advocates chose this same time for another convention at London, which drew an unusually large number of prominent Americans, such as Garrison, Phillips, Tappan, (52) Lucretia Mott, and others. Several of them were interested, also, in peace, and attended the Peace Congress as well.

The Committee on Preparations for the Congress was appointed at a conference held in November of 1850, in the Hall of Commerce, London. To advertise the meeting, Visschers, Garnier, and Varrentrapp circulated invitations in Belgium, France, and Germany, respectively, while in England large public meetings were held to stimulate greater interest. Ministers throughout the land were requested to offer prayers and deliver sermons on peace the Sunday preceeding the sitting of the Congress. (49)

(51)
The London Congress met July 22-24, in Exeter Hall, with

over 1,000 delegates from the United Kingdom alone, one-fifth of whom were ministers. Among the prominent Britishers present were Sir David Brewster, Richard Cobden, Charles Hindley, Samuel Gurney, William Ewart, and Henry Richard. Over sixty Americans from sixteen different states attended, including George C. Beckwith, Burritt, Horace Greeley, and Judge Niles. Among the important Frenchmen present were Cormenin, Say, Garnier, and Coquerel. The Germans were represented by Dr. Creizenach, Varrentrapp, Professor Rau of Heidelberg, Spiess, Dr. Marquardsen, and Dr. Scherzer of Vienna. Visschers came from Belgium. Other continental countries represented were Italy, Spain, Holland, Sweden, and Norway.

A large number of letters from prominent people in various countries were received, expressing adherence to the program of the peace movement, and wishing the Congress success. A partial list of these include the names of Victor Hugo, Dr. Bodenstedt, Herr Jaup, and the Archbishop of Dublin. Others were Barthelemy St. Hilaire, (a member of the National Institute of France, a representative of the people, and a former ambassador to England), Carnot, (a representative of the people and son of the "Organizer of Victory" of French Revolution fame), Victor de Tracy, (former minister of Marine in France), General Subervie, (one of the oldest of the French generals), and Pierre Dionysie Dumelli, (president of the Sardinian Chamber of Deputies). The boroughs of Sheffield and Dunfermline sent congratulatory messages. Thomas Carlyle wrote, "The less war and cutting of throats we have among us,

it will be the better for us all!.....Truly I wish you all the speed possible.....and I beg to subscribe myself."

Sir David Brewster, philosopher, scientist, and philanthropist, was elected president. In his opening speech, Brewster condemned war for the settlement of differences as a "relic of a barbarous age, equally condemned by religion, by reason and by justice."

The first resolution presented dealt with the duty of ministers, teachers, and publicists to use their influence in stamping out animosities, and jealousies, and spreading pacific ideas. Rev. J. A. James of Birmingham, while professing faith in the power of the pulpit, felt that too often the soldier's coat had been thrown over the preacher's gown. Coquerel insisted that peace could not come alone through science and invention, but that the mind must be made to recognize its desirableness and to welcome it. Jules Delbruch, director of "La Revue d'Education Nouvelle" of Paris stressed the importance of formal education in the development of peace sentiment. Children's toys, Cobden felt, should be more carefully selected, and by way of example mentioned the toy soldiers so often given boys.

Vischers introduced a resolution favoring arbitration, and spoke in its support. It was his opinion that if a few of the leading powers of Europe so willed any war in Europe could be prevented. He suggested a European confederation. "Should any king or any people display acts of oppression and conquest, we will point our finger at the culprit and say, 'Thou hast sinned!'" George C. Beckwith,

Secretary of the American Peace Society, spoke in favor of stipulated arbitration, and related recent attempts to secure recognition of the principle in the United States. The resolution carried.

In discussing the next resolution, on disarmament, Cobden struck at the fallacy of preparing for war to preserve peace. He declared that barracks tended to lower the morals of society, and flayed the non-productiveness of armies. "The spirit of the age is to question evils". Mr. MacGregor, M.P. for Glasgow, felt that people should be convinced that standing armies were of no benefit. They cramped rather than preserved public liberties. He showed the influence of war upon the national debt, and asserted that it was for the people to make peace principles an active force. War was childish, but industry mature, was the way Don Jose Segundo Flores, a professor of Political Economy expressed it. The armies of the new industrial era should be workingmen.

Intervention also came up for discussion. Henry Vincent felt that England had a well-developed "bump of meddlesomeness" and was hardly the proper country to give lessons to others on this subject. He looked to the proper education of the people as the only means of securing peace. Garnier denounced intervention as the source of many wars and denied the right to propagate truth by force.

At the London Congress, for the first time in the course of the Peace Congress movement, a resolution was

passed denouncing what has subsequently come to be called "imperialism". This resolution, introduced by Rev. John Burnet, opposed

"the system of aggression and violence practiced by civilized nations upon aboriginal and uncivilized tribes, as leading to incessant and exterminating wars eminently unfavorable to the true progress of religion, civilization and commerce."

Burnet denied the right of foreigners to dispossess the natives of their land on the ground that it could be put to better use. Rev. Frederick Crowe, a missionary in Guatemala, spoke of some of the bad conditions existing in the West Indies. A slight change was suggested in the wording of the resolution by Girardin, who felt that the words "civilized" and "uncivilized" should be changed to "stronger" and "weaker", expressing the opinion that the one which attacked was the less civilized.

At the opening of the morning session of the third day, Henry Vincent led fifteen workmen of Paris to the platform and introduced them. One of them, Pierre Vinsard, an engraver, read an address in French, excerpts from which are given here;

"Citizens of the world!.....War! it crushes our existence.....War! it perpetuates our ignorance.....War! -- Under the pretext of glory, it takes us, full of marrow, and force, and vigor, and often leaves us feeble and mutilated. War! It is not only violent, terrible; it takes all forms, and presents to us mechanical labourers, its most sad, its most poignant aspect, in the shape of misery.....Nationalities are disappearing; and in a few years, by your efforts, they will exist only in name. Their rivalry can now only be excited by those productions of their industry, which they shall create and distribute among all men, by one and the same country, until the time when the word and idea, "Nation", shall be effaced from our

language and manners. The greatest nation will be that which counts the most happy labourers and fewest soldiers...."

Sentiments of a similar character were expressed by Dr. Creizenach of Frankfort, who began his speech,

"Father Rhine and Father Thames pour their waters into the same ocean; so may the two nations -- so may all nations, pour out their material and intellectual abundance into one ocean of universal peace and welfare....."

Richard Cobden was especially interested in the subject of war loans, next introduced. Gilpin, who rose to speak on the resolution, asked, "Have we yet to learn that the Utopia of one age is the experience of the next?" He felt that since the Congress had condemned war in the abstract it should go still further and strike at its sinews -- loans. He felt that men who loaned money for such purposes were morally responsible. Edward Miall, who held a similar view, felt it was unjust for one generation

"to mortgage the industry of generations to come..... No man ought to be taxed except with his own consent, or that of his representatives.....If only we could make each generation pay for its own wars -- if wars were never carried on upon credit -- if only the cash had to come out of the pocket before the opening of the war could commence -- I think the judgment of Parliament would be different from what it is, as to what constitutes the necessity of international war".

As a remedy he advocated the proper education of public opinion. Samuel Gurney, a Quaker capitalist, concurred in the resolution. Cobden announced at this time that the rumor was being circulated that Austria was attempting to negotiate a loan. If it were true, he offered to take an active part in

a public meeting at the London Tavern to oppose its success.

Cormenin proposed the practical resolution that the Peace Societies in constitutional countries should use their influence in electing representatives to assemblies who were friendly to peace and who were willing to carry out their program.

Elihu Burritt moved a resolution favoring the formation of an authoritative Code of International Law, without saying therein how such a Code was to be formed. But in a speech supporting his resolution, Burritt suggested that the Code could be formed by a commission of jurists and diplomatists. As Resolutions of preceeding congresses had provided for a Congress of Nations or a Congress of the Representatives of the nations to perform this function, a retreat from the plan of William Ladd is very noticeable. It is probably accounted for by the fact that since the Paris Congress of 1849, the movement was growing more and more practical and the leaders, perhaps realized that it would be a long time before people would be willing to adopt such a scheme as Ladd's. Also, Cobden, one of the most influential peace men, opposed it. The resolution received the support of Coignet, (53) (a Lyons silk manufacturer), Peut, and Bouvet. Bouvet spoke at some length, dealing with the recent progress of peace principles in France, especially among the commercial and laboring classes and the democratic party. He then entered into a discussion of the need of a universal congress, thus going beyond the resolution, and gave an extended list of

things it could accomplish;

".....Finally, the Universal Congress would impart to all tongues a character of unity, would reduce weights, measures and moneys to one common standard, would render uniform all scientific observations, statistics, the arts, and moral, intellectual, and commercial relations. It would be the living voice, the Logos of the human mind, reigning over the pacific universe.....It would be the corner-stone of the vast social edifice.....Gentlemen, so grand an institution as this, you will establish, doubt it not! You are the apostolic upper-chamber whence shall issue a new form of law, proper to the spirit of Christianity, and to the aspirations of the human mind.....Let us pursue yet a few years longer, the propagation of our doctrines of peace.....the time is coming when governments must submit to public opinion."

At Joseph Sturge's instance the Congress voted to hold another meeting the following year, but it was destined never to meet, as shall be seen.

The London Congress was the last great Congress of the series of peace meetings held annually since 1848. The movement throughout this period had been rapidly increasing in prestige. Had it been allowed to continue for a few years longer, who can say what accomplishments it might have made, even at that early day? Unfortunately, the war-spirit, which had been latent during the period, aroused itself with a vengeance, and threatened to sweep aside all that the peace men had so laboriously accomplished.

Since the peace meeting was held in London it was well advertised by the press there, and as usual, there were comments pro and con. The "Morning Chronicle" called it Utopian, and "The Times", which had on previous occasions belittled it in every way possible, now chose to ignore it

entirely, as did also the "Daily News". The "Morning Advertiser" was very friendly. Most of the weekly and provincial papers likewise were favorable. (54) "The Spectator", July 26, stated,

"....Meetings, at which Sir David Brewster presides, which M. de Girardin visits, and Victor Hugo recognizes, and which are backed by the whole influence of Exeter Hall, are realities.....During the three days that the Congress sat this week, some abstract principles and sentiments were expressed and well expressed, which command the assent of all reflecting men. The practical suggestions at the conference were perhaps less felicitous." (54)

"The Economist", a free trade journal, admitted,

"....They seem to be gaining ground in public estimation.....Free trade and they are close allies.....therefore we share the hopes of the members of the Peace Congress." (54)

The "Standard of Freedom" was enthusiastic over the Congress,

"....A more glorious meeting was never held.... Men....may deem its aim unattainable or its means impracticable; but they cannot sneer at a cause which enrolls amongst its advocates the Cobdens, and Humboldts, and Brewsters.....of our own day.....Respectable journalism no longer regards it as a monstrous folly, only to be laughed to scorn.....The Congress has gained respectful attention from the Press." (54)

A distinctly different attitude was expressed by "The Sun",

"Our comical friends, the self-elected apostles of arbitration are at it again. They really appear to be incorrigible -- incorrigible we mean not only in their pertinacity, but in a stupidity that surpasses all comprehension. Exeter Hall -- the Hall of Humbugs -- has been selected for their present demonstration.....They are declaiming with all the force of their lungs and their rhetoric against the horrors of war. As if any one had been eulogizing it!.....Tubal Cain is to be eclipsed by each of them as an ingenious fabricator, for it is by their hands.....that swords are to be beaten into ployghshares and spears twisted into reaping hooks.....Against their preposterous pretensions we cannot enter our protest too emphatically. There is to us in the whole scheme a self-sufficiency so enormous, an

assumption of moral superiority so congress and reprehensible that we must enter our objections to their proceedings whensoever and wheresoever the society in question may please to indulge themselves with a new demonstration." (54)

Two important peace meetings were held in January, 1853, at Manchester and in October of the same year, but strictly speaking, they do not belong in the international peace congress movement, inasmuch as they were English conferences called for the specific purpose of combatting the rise of the war spirit.

Therefore, of the regular sequence of international Peace Congresses of this period, this London Congress of 1851 was the last. It had been a noteworthy movement with most significant influences.

CHAPTER IV

FAILURES AND ACHIEVEMENTS

In the following proceedings of the Peace Congresses, the reader has, no doubt, been impressed by the increasing practicality of the peace movement. The efforts of the friends of peace in the period of organization and expansion, 1815-43, had been largely confined to propagating their ideas among the masses. The period of the Congresses, however, in line with its more practical nature, witnesses the attempts of the pacifists to secure governmental recognition of their principles and thereby to actually realize their great objective, -- universal peace.

The first successes of this sort were won in the state legislatures of New England, even somewhat earlier than the calling of the first peace convention. In 1837, the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts recommended "a Congress or a Court of Nations as at present the best practical method by which disputes between nations can be adjusted, and an appeal to arms avoided", and requested the Executive of the United States "to open a negotiation with other governments with a view to effect so important an arrangement."⁽¹⁾ This came just at the time when the American Peace Society was holding peace-essay contests, which produced the famous Ladd plan, published three years later. Again, in 1838, the Mass-

Massachusetts Legislature passed by a unanimous vote in the House and with only two dissenting votes in the Senate, still more explicit resolves, favoring "a Congress of Nations for the purpose of framing a Code of International Law, and the establishment of a High Court of Arbitration for the settlement of controversies between nations", and requesting the Governor of Massachusetts to transmit a copy of the resolutions to the President of the United States and the Executive of each State, as well as to their own legislative representatives at Washington.

The year 1844, just following the London Peace Convention brought more action in Massachusetts when the legislature voted a series of four resolutions. These recognized arbitration as a practical and desirable substitute for war in settling international differences, and declared that a code of well-defined International Law and a Permanent Court were preferable to the occasional choice of umpires acting without established principles and rules. They further expressed the desire that the United States should take measures to obtain the consent of other powers to establish a General Congress of Nations for the object of codifying International Law and establishing a Court of Nations. The Governor was instructed to transmit copies of the resolves, and an accompanying report, to the Massachusetts congressmen at Washington with instructions to use their influence
(1)
in furthering these ideas.

Vermont, following the lead of Massachusetts, on March

3, 1851, passed unanimously the resolution that the representatives of that State in congress should be requested to use their influence

"in such ways as they may deem most effectual, to secure whenever practicable, a provision in the treaties of our Government with other nations for referring to the decision of umpires all misunderstandings that cannot be satisfactorily adjusted by amicable negotiation." (3)

During the period 1837-1856, Congress was deluged with arbitration memorials and petitions from groups in all sections of the Union, representing local, county, state, and (2) even national organizations. This steady stream of communications called forth several reports on the subject from committees in the House of Representatives and the Senate. The first such report was made in the House of Representatives by Hugh S. Legaré of South Carolina, for the Committee of Foreign Affairs, in response to memorials of the Peace Society at New York and of others, requesting that differences with Mexico be settled by arbitration, and that the principle be incorporated into a Congress of Nations. The Committee report disapproved the idea of the Congress of Nations because it did not yet have the support of public opinion, but stated that peace based on the restrictions and protection of law was the ideal of civil society. The report did, however, "heartily concur with the memorialists in recommending a reference to a third power of all such controversies as can safely be confined to any tribunal unknown

to the Constitution of this Country". Such a practice, it was felt, would be followed by other nations and would develop into the "customary law of civilized nations"⁽⁴⁾. Feeling that this action satisfactorily disposed of the matter, Legaré, the following year, having received additional petitions on the subject, asked that his committee be excused from further consideration of the question of arbitration.⁽⁵⁾ May 11, 1846, at the moment of the opening of the Mexican War, a third report was made in the House by Howell Cobb of Georgia, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in reply to petitions based on the Ladd plan. While it praised the object of securing peace, the report did not believe there was much hope of avoiding war until human-nature was radically changed, and since such a change involved the problem of a moral reform, it was declared impractical for the legislature to act. The third paragraph of the report contained the traditional argument of American isolation,

"Situated as the United States Government is in its relations to the other important governments of the world, peculiar in its organization, and incorporating into its system fundamental principles, warring with the very elements of the principal of European Governments, engenders (sic) a jealousy of our institutions which renders an intimate relation between them and us, as proposed by the petitioners wholly inconsistent with our rights and interests."

(6)

Cobb's report was read and laid on the table.

On January 16, 1849, Mr. Tuck, a Free Soil member of the House of Representatives asked leave to make a resolution di-

recting the Committee of Foreign Affairs to inquire into the expediency of authorizing the Secretary of State to procure arbitration agreements with other countries, and to take up with them the proposition of establishing a Congress of Nations. Tuck's request, however, met with objection and was not even received. About three weeks later, Tuck moved the suspension of the rules in order that he might introduce a new resolution favoring the adoption of stipulated arbitration agreements with foreign countries, omitting, this time, any reference to a Congress of Nations. (7) The motion lost. In commenting upon Tuck's efforts, the "Providence Daily Transcript" asked the question why such propositions as those included in his rejected resolutions, should not come from the United States, (8)

"....claiming as we do the highest development of republicanism, civilization, and Christianity. The truth is we are falling behind the age, while new-born republics are outstripping us in the progress which makes the present era. We do not complain of the present Congress for refusing to pass these resolutions. To do so would be inconsistent, just coming as they do out of the crimes of the war upon Mexico The passage of the anti-war resolutions would be ridiculous unless it was done as an act of repentance.....(9)

More gratifying was the later Senate action upon a memorial from the American Peace Society, presented by Robert C. Winthrop of Boston, in December of 1850. In order to aid in securing favorable action on Winthrop's memorial, G. C. Beckwith, Secretary of the American Peace Society, went to Washington to interview various prominent officials. One of

his most cordial receptions was by Senator Henry Stuart Foote of Mississippi, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the very committee to which the peace memorials had been referred. The senator assured Beckwith,

".... You are right, sir. I like the proposal throughout. Not only is your object unquestionably good, but the measure you suggest is perfectly simple and reasonable; indeed it is in substance the very thing we have all along been doing in our republic -- the identical principle on which the members of our confederation, these thirty-one state sovereignties, adjust their own disputes with each other." (10)

Beckwith had not expected such encouragement from a pro-slavery man, and was inclined at first to suspect Foote's sincerity. His doubts, however, were dispelled when, on February 5, Foote reported from his committee a resolution which (11) had received the unanimous concurrence of its members. The resolution follows:

"Resolved, that in the judgment of this body it would be proper and desirable for the Government of these United States, wherever practical, to secure in its treaties with other nations a provision for referring to the decision of umpires all future misunderstandings that can not be satisfactorily adjusted by amicable negotiations, in the first instance, before a resort to hostilities shall be had." (12)

The resolution, however, was not adopted by the Senate, inasmuch as the motion of Senator Jeremiah Clemens of Alabama, (11) to "Let it lie over", prevailed. It is of much significance, however, that the arbitration resolution received the unanimous support of the especially important Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The principle of arbitration was sure-

ly gaining ground.

Beckwith took a copy of the Committee's resolution before President Fillmore, his cabinet members, and several of the foreign ministers at Washington. On his visit he encountered few objections. Secretary Conrad of the War Department, said, "Your object is certainly excellent; nor can I see anything objectionable in the measure you propose for its attainment"⁽¹⁰⁾. More emphatic in his approval was Thomas Corwin of Ohio, Secretary of the Treasury. "If I were the head of the State Department," he declared, "I should deem such a resolution imperative upon me to negotiate all future treaties on that principle. Indeed, I have long been of this way of thinking; and sometimes I have been tempted to say if nations will not settle their disputes by arbitration they should be compelled, if there be any means of compelling them to do so. I assure you, sir, if the question should ever come before any cabinet of which I may be a member, I shall certainly give my vote in its favor; nor can I conceive any contingency in which I would not go for it with all my heart."⁽¹⁰⁾

Early in the year 1853, the legislatures of Rhode Island, Maine, and Massachusetts passed resolutions, almost without dissension, favoring the adoption of the policy of stipulated arbitration by the national government. In each case their congressmen were requested to support such resolutions in Congress. State pressure of this sort, joined with an ever-increasing number of petitions and memorials from

the peace societies and others, resulted in further action in the Senate. On February 22, 1853, Senator James R. Underwood of Kentucky, a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported a resolution favoring stipulated arbitration "whenever it may be practicable". In the committee there had been opposition, and it was only by means of a letter from Stephen A. Douglas, an absent member, that Underwood was enabled to submit the resolution. Douglas, while declining to commit himself as favoring the proposition, nevertheless did feel that it should be submitted to the Senate for its consideration. The Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, James Mason of Virginia, informed the Senate that he was opposed to the conclusion as well as the reasoning of the lengthy report which accompanied the resolution, and though the report was ordered printed, the resolution was not debated in the Senate.

Underwood's able report merits discussion. It did not oppose defensive war against aggression. The destructiveness of war, and its effects upon moral and intellectual progress were developed. The report held that "the peace, happiness and good order of society imperatively demanded the establishment of courts of justice". Then, after listing a number of arguments for such a court, it stated that the Committee was not willing to go further than to propose arbitration. Concerning the timeliness of the adoption of such a policy, it was further stated,

"The present state of the world is peculiarly favorable for the introduction of such a policy. The powerful Christian nations are at peace with each other. Their prosperity and happiness have been rapidly advancing during the years of peace they have enjoyed. No greater calamity can befall them than breaking up the peace which so happily prevails.... There are powerful and rapidly accumulating interests in favor of peace and adverse to war. The interests of commerce, which, through the enterprise of Christian nations have penetrated almost every region of the earth, binding our race together by a more intimate intercourse and stronger fellowship, would be greatly injured by a state of war..
.." (14)

In spite of the fact that legislation on the subject of arbitration in the period of the '40's and '50's did not advance beyond the resolution stage, the principle was incorporated in several important treaties of the time. To what extent the peace societies were responsible for this increased recognition, one is unable to judge, but having followed their efforts in popularizing the idea at their international Congresses, and having noted their attempts to secure legislative action, one cannot but feel that their general influence was great. While there was some reason for the peace men to be encouraged by the action in Congress, still there was also cause for discouragement in not receiving more positive action, in the light of earlier use of the arbitration by the American Government.

The first recognition of the principle of arbitration by the United States is found in the Jay Treaty of 1794, which provided for the settlement of three specific differences with Great Britain by commissions chosen for the

(15)

purpose. Subsequently arbitration was frequently resorted to. In the thirty-six-year period between the War of 1812 and the Mexican War, the United States in at least seventeen specific cases of dispute with another country, used this method of settlement. Hence it would seem that arbitration had all but become a regular policy of the American Government.

(16)

At the close of the war with Mexico, a new development in the recognition of arbitration appeared in Article XXI of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, which contained a general arbitration agreement in the following words,

(17)

"If unhappily any disagreement should hereafter arise between the Governments of the two republics, whether with respect to the interpretation of any stipulation in this treaty, or with respect to any other particular concerning the political or commercial relations of the two nations, the said Governments, in the name of those nations, do promise to each other that they will endeavor, in the most sincere and earnest manner, to settle the differences so arising, and to preserve the state of peace and friendship in which the two countries are now placing themselves, using for this end, mutual representations and pacific negotiations. And if, by these means, they should not be enabled to come to an agreement, a resort shall not, on this account, be had to reprisals, aggression or hostility of any kind, by the one republic against the other, until the Government of that which deems itself aggrieved shall have maturely considered, in the spirit of peace and good neighborhood, whether it would not be better that such difference should be settled by the arbitration of commissioners appointed on each side, or by that of a friendly nation. And should such course be proposed by either party, it shall be acceded to by the other, unless deemed by it altogether incompatible with the nature of the difference, or the circumstances of the case." (13)

An examination of the official documents bearing on

this treaty sheds little light on the question of how this clause found its way into the treaty. Among the papers submitted to Congress, as published, such a clause did not appear in the original or supplementary instructions from the State Department to Nicholas J. Trist, the American negotiator, nor did it appear in the project given by the Mexican Cabinet to its commissioners, and the counter project which they subsequently presented to Trist were likewise silent on the matter. The clause is first found in the draft of the treaty which Trist submitted to the State Department. It seems then that Article XXI, inserted without direct authorization during the negotiations between Trist and the Mexican commissioners, although the definite endorsement in the President's next annual message suggests that Trist's action was not presumptuous. For the side of Mexico all we have is a letter which accompanied the counter project submitted to Trist by the Mexicans. In this there appears the statement that the peace between both countries would be established with greater solidarity "if a friendly power (England) which has so nobly offered its good offices to grant its guarantee for the faithful fulfillment of the treaty which may be considered. The Mexican Government understands that it would be very proper to solicit this guarantee". The United States would not, of course, have recognized the right of Great Britain to supervise the fulfillment of a treaty which she had made with another country. From the Mexican request, however, it appears that they were seeking security against further

American aggression. Might not a discussion of this point during the negotiations have suggested the general arbitral clause?

A more plausible explanation for the appearance of Article XXI in the treaty is that arbitration agreements had, by 1848, become with the American State Department a common means of settling minor differences. In the period 1812-1848, the principle had been invoked on an average of about once every two years, and in the decade following the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo it was applied to eight cases. It is of significance that in 1839, and again in 1843, arbitration had been resorted to in debt difficulties between the United States and Mexico, and Trist, the American negotiator, through his position as Chief Clerk of the State Department, equivalent to permanent under secretary of state, was in a position to know its policies peculiarly well.

Inasmuch as Article XXI was in exact accord with the Jay plan of stipulated arbitration which had for some time been a major plank in the platform of the peace societies, one is inclined to suspect them of having influenced its insertion. It does not seem reasonable that the peace men would have allowed such an excellent opportunity as the peace with Mexico to pass by without an attempt to insure the country against the recurrence of another war with the sister Republic to the south. Yet a careful examination of the American "Advocate of Peace" and the British "Herald of

Peace", reveals no evidence which would justify this contention. Ordinarily the Peace Societies loudly proclaimed their triumphs in order to gain public attention and influence. If they had been responsible for the insertion of Article XXI, it is inconceivable that they would not have claimed credit for it.

During the course of the war the peace men frequently demanded its cessation, and not a few references were made to arbitration. (20) The January (1847) number of the "Advocate of Peace" reprinted three petitions which had been sent to President Polk, asking him to end the war. One of these contained the following statement: "We can obtain by negotiation or reference all our just rights; and should we by the sword wrest more than these it would prove only a curse". Another, in the form of a letter from the American Peace Society, urged the President to accept Great Britain's offer of mediation. The October (1847) number of the "Advocate of Peace" published a petition from the London Peace Society to President Polk, asking that he end the war and arbitrate the difficulties. A similar one was sent to Santa Ana, President of Mexico. Others were addressed to the rulers of Great Britain, France, Russia, Austria, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Sweden, urging them to recommend arbitration to the warring countries. (20)

(21)

In a letter to Lewis Tappan, written between October 30, 1848 and June 12, 1849, Joseph Sturge gave an account of Lord John Russell's reception of the peace committee which present-

ed him the declaration adopted by the Brussels Congress. In the course of this interview Elihu Burritt mentioned the fact that in the late treaty between the United States and Mexico there had been included a clause providing for general arbitration. Lord John Russell, in reply, was reported as saying, "If your (the American) Government will make a similar proposition to ours, it shall be taken into serious consideration". Sturge, who regarded this statement as very significant, urged Burritt at the time to exert himself to induce his Government to propose such a measure to Great Britain. In his Tappan letter, Sturge said, "Now, I attach such immense importance to this point being pushed that I do not think there is anything to which thou couldst devote a part of thy time that would more conduce to the benefit of the human family". His interest in the matter was increased by the fact that just at that time the friends of peace were carrying on a very lively campaign in Great Britain to secure support for the arbitration resolution which Cobden had determined to lay before Parliament. Sturge felt, no doubt, that an American proposal for stipulated arbitration, received at a time when the subject was prominent in the public mind there, would be favorably received.

Anomalous as it may seem, Lord Russell may have been influenced in making his significant statement by Lord Palmerston, the bête noir of the peace party, and the chief opponent of Cobden's arbitration resolution. Palmerston, as the

following extract from a letter to Lord Russell In January of 1848 indicates, favored arbitration agreements in some cases: (22)

"If, as I hope, we shall succeed in altering our Navigation Laws, and if, as a consequence, Great Britain and the United States shall place their commercial marines upon a footing of mutual equality might not such an arrangement afford us a good opportunity for endeavoring to carry in some degree into execution the wish which Mr. Fox entertained in 1783, when he wishes to substitute close alliance in the place of sovereignty and dependence as the connecting link between the United States and Great Britain.

"....might they not, with mutual advantage, conclude a treaty containing something like the following conditions:--

"1st. That in all cases of difference which may hereafter, unfortunately, arise between the contracting parties, they will in the first place, have recourse to the (mediation or arbitration) of some friendly power; and that hostilities shall not begin between them until every endeavor to settle their difference by some means shall have proved fruitless....."

The American pacifists, stimulated by the favorable action of congressional committees, discussed above, directed their efforts toward securing arbitration clauses in the Claims and Fisheries treaties pending with Great Britain in 1853. Authorities at Washington asserted their willingness to include such clauses, provided the Government of Great Britain would likewise concur. Being apprised of this, the Peace Conference Committees of London and Manchester obtained an interview with the Earl of Clarendon, Secretary of Foreign Affairs. The address which this group presented to the Foreign Secretary cited the recent favorable action (23)

(24)

in America, and requested that Clarendon instruct the British negotiators to introduce into the treaties then being negotiated, a clause providing for the adjustment by arbitration of any differences that might thereafter arise between the two countries. Cobden, when introducing the deputation, urged the timeliness of the proposal. While Clarendon declared himself favorable to peace, he was not convinced that the method proposed would insure it. He felt that the "spirit of the age, the improved feeling and good sense of mankind -- of those to whom governments are obliged to defer more than they had done..." were more effective guarantees than written engagements. Hume, another member of the deputation, cited cases of the successful use of arbitration, and urged that the proposal would be valuable in showing that the dispositions of governments was to preserve peace. To this contention Clarendon expressed no opposition, but as "the question was rather a novel one," he refused to promise more than to give it his earnest consideration. In the address presented, and in the discussion which followed, the Foote resolution and the Underwood resolution and report were referred to. When Cobden expressed the hope that the British Government would not hesitate to meet the Americans half-way, Clarendon asked to see a copy of the Underwood report, and Cobden promised to send him one.

(24)

(25)

Article I of the Claims Convention of 1853, concluded February 8, and proclaimed August 20, provided for a commission of two "to examine impartially and carefully and accord-

ing to justice and equity" the disputed claims. If they failed to agree in a given case, a third person was to be appointed to act as umpire or arbitrator. This is by no means a new development, and certainly is far removed from the general arbitral clause which the peace men were demanding. It is very doubtful whether it was in any way influenced by the deputation to Clarendon, especially since the undated report of the interview did not appear until the June number of the "Herald of Peace", while the treaty had been signed in the preceding February. The "Herald of Peace", in October, reprinted the text of the treaty, but made no claim of having influenced it.

The "Reciprocity Treaty as to Fisheries, Duties, and Navigation" etc., concluded between the United States and Great Britain, June 5, 1854, provided for an arbitration arrangement very similar to that found in the Claims Convention, for the settlement of disputes as to places reserved exclusively to British and American fishermen. Again, while the treaty recognized the principle of arbitration, it was not the general provision which the peace men had wished, and their influence upon it is doubtful.

The Free Soil party, a liberal movement opposed to the extension of slavery, in its platform of 1852 contained a section favoring arbitration, as follows;

"...We recommend the introduction into all treaties hereafter to be negotiated between the United States and foreign nations of some provision for the amicable settlement of difficulties by a resort to decisive arbitration." (28)

It is quite likely that this plank was inserted at the instance of Senator Sumner, one of the prominent leaders of the party, for, in 1845, he wrote as follows to Henry K. Oliver, Adjutant General of Massachusetts;

"....I am anxious to commend to our country the duty of taking immediate steps by negotiation or otherwise, to induce the nations to adopt a system of arbitration or a Congress of Nations and determine peacefully disputes between nations. I am anxious that our country, that the Whig party, (Sumner was then a Whig) should make this a part of its fundamental policy...."

Other leaders of the Free Soil party were James G. Birney, Salmon P. Chase, Charles F. Adams, and Martin Van Buren. As early as the Thirty-first Congress, it had gained two senators and fourteen representatives. In the following mid-term election of 1850, Sumner, in addition, was sent to the Senate, and its strength in the House was increased by three. At the opening of the Thirty-third Congress, the party controlled five votes in the Senate and seventeen in the House. The Free Soilers in the election of 1852 polled 150,000 votes.

While the friends of peace were working for legislative recognition of the principle of arbitration in the United States, similar activity was being carried on in Great Britain. In order to preserve the enthusiasm aroused by the Brussels Peace Congress of 1848, and to lay the matter of arbitration before the country in a forcible manner, Cobden determined to introduce a resolution into the House of Commons. The resolution asked

"that an humble address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that she will be graciously pleased to di-

rect her Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to enter into communication with Foreign Powers, inviting them to concur in treaties, binding the respective parties in the event of any future misunderstanding, which cannot be arranged by amicable negotiation, to refer the matter in dispute to the discussion of arbitrators." (30)

Cobden had originally intended to bring forward his motion on March 29, but on that day he was forced to give way to John O'Connell who had precedence for an important motion on Irish affairs. That necessitated a postponement (31) to April 24, after the Easter recess, but again an important matter forced a postponement of the resolution, and (32) finally the date of June 12 was fixed. The great difficulty in bringing forward such a motion lay in the hostile attitude of a great majority of the members of Parliament, who, perfectly satisfied to continue along old lines, very grudgingly agreed to new methods and principles. They felt that their judgment on the management of foreign affairs was vastly superior to that of the peace group, who they ridiculed as Utopians. In light of this situation it was difficult to find a person of sufficient standing to bring forward such a measure. But Cobden, who had played a very prominent part in the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, and who believed in the principle of arbitration, came forward, a fearless champion. The first announcement of his intention drew a general laugh in the House of Commons, concerning which he wrote,

"Ever since the beginning of the session I had to run the gauntlet of the small wits of the

House, who amused themselves at my expense, and tittered at the very word 'arbitration'. (33)

In order to enlist public opinion in the support of Cobden, the London Peace Society and Burritt's League of Universal Brotherhood joined in holding something like 150 public meetings in all parts of the kingdom. During this campaign nearly 50,000 letters and circulars had been scattered through the mail. Hundreds of thousands of copies of printed matter also had been circulated. During the six-months' period of agitation the press was full of discussions concerning the activity of the Peace Society and the question of arbitration. A thousand petitions were showered upon Parliament, some of them bearing as many as 10,000 signatures. (34) Altogether they contained about 200,000 signatures. This well illustrates the great hold which the idea of arbitration was taking upon the public mind of England, and also indicates the significance of the Peace Society in influencing it. Since the membership of the peace societies all told probably did not exceed 40,000 by 1850, it is evident that the great majority of the signers were not members of the Society, but nevertheless, recognized the wisdom of arbitration, and were willing to cooperate. Can the effects of such a campaign be over-estimated? Can there exist a doubt that this sort of activity at the mid-Nineteenth Century paved the way for the great arbitration development of more recent date?

On the eve of the day of presentation of the question,

a great public demonstration was held in Exeter Hall, London.⁽³⁵⁾ Of the 3,000 who attended this meeting, it was estimated that about nine-tenths were men of the middle class. Charles Hindley, M.P., presided, and speeches were made by Henry Richard, John Bright, Joseph Brotherton, John Burnet, William Ewart, and Elihu Burritt. A petition to Parliament was drawn up favoring the Cobden resolution.

The next day, June 12, Cobden moved the resolution, and supported it in a forceful speech,⁽³⁰⁾ marked by its courage, practicality, and sound logic. He spoke as the representative of two bodies, the peace group and the numerous middle classes and workers, who opposed war primarily for economic reasons. After explaining his proposition and citing numerous cases of the practical application of the principle, he then answered several objections to arbitration commonly advanced. He arraigned the military situation of England and of Europe, and expressed the opinion that the limit of taxation had almost been reached. To the surprise of most of his enemies, as well as to many of his friends in the Peace Society, Cobden declared his disapproval of a Congress of Nations, which he felt might lead to armed interventions. Nor did he advance a plan for compelling the fulfillment of arbitration treaties, but, he stated,

"...If you make a treaty with another country, binding it to refer any dispute to arbitration, and if that country violated that treaty you will place it in so infamous a position, that I doubt if any country would enter into war on such bad grounds as that country must occupy."...

He felt that if the more powerful nations adopted stipulated arbitration that a precedent would be established which would develop into a sort of common law among nations. His closing argument was,

"....no possible harm can arise from the failure of my plan. The worst that can be said of it is, that it will not effect its object -- that of averting war."

(36)

Cobden was ably seconded by William Ewart. The first opposition was expressed by B. Cochrane, who derided the Peace Society and Cobden with it. Lord Robert Grosvenor did not feel that Cochrane had met Cobden's arguments, and while he was "not ambitious of martyrdom", he stated his willingness to stand with Cobden for the motion, in the face of ridicule. He criticized Cobden's attack as having been made in too warlike a manner and expressed himself in favor of preparedness, but he did not believe arbitration was practicable and stressed the powerful influence favorable British action upon the resolution would have upon the rest of the world. Grosvenor further urged its adoption on the ground of reducing expenditures. Mackinnon and Colonel Thompson likewise spoke favorably.

Determined opposition came from Urquhart, who, however, had been robbed of most of his thunder by Cobden's declaration against a Congress of Nations, having prepared to meet Cobden on that ground. The effectiveness of his speech was impaired by the fact that most of it was beside the point. Hobhouse declared that the desire to maintain the

abuses and grievances of the times was worse than aspiring for a Utopia.

Palmerston then rose to eulogize suavely Cobden's motion and his intentions, but felt that it was dangerous to peace to let other countries get the impression that the "manly spirit of Englishmen is dead". He stated that a strong defense was necessary for protection against enemies, and that arbitration was founded on an impracticable principle. He accused Cobden of recognizing this fact and of having changed the resolution which he had originally intended to present. Palmerston, too, apparently, had expected Cobden to propose a Congress of Nations. Cobden interrupted to protest that he had not changed his resolution in the least. Palmerston then made a great deal of the unsuccessful award of the King of the Netherlands in attempting to settle the Maine boundary dispute between Great Britain and the United States. He further held that arbitration was dangerous to Great Britain because she had "so many rivals and enemies". After other supporters of the resolution, Gibson, Roebuck, and Hume, had spoken, the vote on the previous question was put, and Cobden's resolution was defeated by a vote of 79 to 176. The debate upon the resolution, however, was generally regarded as a triumph for the peace cause. Three days afterwards, Cobden wrote Joseph Sturge a long letter concerning the event, in which he said,

(37)
 "....A close scrutiny of the division lists throws a very great preponderance of public opinion on the side of the minority.... which

comprises the representatives of nearly all the largest constituencies. For instance, not one of the county members for Middlesex, West Riding of Yorkshire, and North and South Lancashire, voted in the majority; they were all with us or absent. Those constituencies are generally admitted to be fair tests of public opinion. Not one of the metropolitan members voted against us except Lord John Russell.

"I never knew a question which made such rapid progress in the House. You will recall my telling you in February and March of the jeers and laughter with which the first petitions for arbitration treaties were received. All that was changed into serious and respectful attention to the subject, by the efforts of your peace party out of doors, and the flood of petitions which was poured in from all parts of the country..... I have no doubt that success will crown your efforts at no distant period.".....

About this same time there was much to indicate that Sir Robert Peel was drawing close to the ideas of the peace group. In a speech on taxation delivered March 12, 1850,⁽³⁸⁾ Peel expressed himself strongly in favor of a policy of retrenchment. In it he declared that the maxim "If you wish peace prepare for war", should be received with caution and that it admitted much qualification. He felt that no greater benefit could come to the human race than a proportional reduction of their armaments, thereby relieving the tax burden on their subjects. But, unfortunately, before his powerful influence had been actively enlisted in the cause of peace, Peel died. Cobden in a letter soon afterwards said,

"I had observed his tendencies most attentively during the last few years and had felt convinced that on questions in which I take a great interest such as the reduction of armaments, retrenchment of expenditures, the diffusion of peace principles, etc., he had strong sympathies -- stronger than he had yet expressed -- in favor of my

views. Read his last speech again, and observe what he says about diplomacy, and in favor of settling international disputes by reference to mediation instead of by ships of war".(39)

The Peace Congress of Paris of 1849 had adopted a resolution condemning foreign war loans. In the fall of that year, the Austrian Government advertised in the London papers for subscriptions to a loan of £7,100,000. It was, of course, necessitated by the revolts of 1848-9. The joint action of Austria and Russia in the Hungarian revolt had aroused much hostile feeling in England, so that now some opposed the loan on the ground that it was to pay the expense of crushing Hungarian liberties. Cobden, in order to prevent the success of the proposed loan, called a public meeting at London Tavern, where he denounced it in unmeasured terms,

"....not merely for its inherent waste of national wealth, not only because it anticipates income and consumes capital, but also on the ground of injustice to posterity, in entailing upon the heirs of this generation a debt which it has no right to call upon them to pay." (40)

He declared that the finances of the Austrian Government were in a precarious condition, and that the people should be warned against making this dangerous loan. Moreover, he held morally responsible those "who could not plead patriotism, self-defence, or even anger, or the love of military glory", and appealed for sounder morality on the question. (40)

Early in 1850, the Russian Government wishes to borrow £5,500,000 of English capital, ostensibly for the building of a railway from St. Petersburg to Moscow. Again Cobden de-

(41)

nounced a loan in a public meeting at the London Tavern, on the ground that the money was not to be used for a railway, but to pay the cost of the Russian expedition into Hungary in 1849. Despite Cobden's efforts to the contrary, the foreign governments were generally able to borrow English money whenever they needed it. Few shared the moral scruples of the peace group in this matter.

Similar efforts to secure governmental adoption of pacific measures were by no means restricted to the United States and Great Britain. In the summer of 1848, Arnold Ruge moved in the German National Assembly, the following resolution;

"That, as armed peace, by its standing armies imposes an intolerable burden upon the people of Europe and endangers civil freedom, we therefore recognize the necessity of calling into existence a Congress of Nations, for the purpose of effecting a general disarmament of Europe."

He supported the resolution in an able speech which received applause from the Assembly and gallery, but the
(42)
resolution did not carry.

In the new National Assembly of the second French Republic, Francisque Bouvet, on January 8, 1849, introduced resolutions calling upon the French Republic to propose to the world a Congress of Nations to consider the question of proportional disarmament, the abolition of war, and the
(43)
adoption of the practice of disarmament instead. The resolution went so far as to set the date of the Congress and proposed Constantinople as the place of meeting. M. Sarans

denied that war was unfavorable to civilization or opposed to the prosperity of all States. He held that war was the source of England's greatness, and felt sure that she would not agree to peace founded on the principle of arbitration. War, he felt, was necessary to the passions and as a check on too large an increase of population. That there would always be war, was the opinion of Heeckeren, who could not conceive of an organized force capable of controlling refractory states. Aylies, who supported the resolutions, cited the heavy debt which war had imposed upon England, and foresaw a condition of universal peace in the future. Another who sympathized with the object of the resolution was Jobez, but he, nevertheless, felt that it was premature. The discussion resulted in the appointment of a committee of five to prepare a report on Bouvet's resolutions. This committee included all those who had spoken on the subject with the exception of Bouvet himself, with Bavignier in addition. It approved the principle but rejected the expediency of the proposition at that time. The resolution, when re-submitted with the report, received 162 votes, insufficient (44) to carry it.

It is evident from the foregoing discussion of the attempts of the peace men to gain governmental recognition of their principles, that they were making considerable headway, in spite of the fact that nothing very specific had yet been accomplished. The mere fact that their ideas

were given serious consideration in the leading legislative bodies of Europe and America, of itself indicates a distinct advancement. An excellent illustration of the increased popular esteem for the peace movement is found in the invitation which was received at the Frankfort Peace Congress in 1850, asking the Congress to attempt a settlement of the controversy between Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein. This invitation, which was incidentally mentioned in the preceding chapter, deserves fuller treatment here, in order to illustrate the important position which the peace movement was assuming, and to show how near three pacifist leaders came to securing the settlement of a troublesome and dangerous question which puzzled the leading diplomats of Europe. In order to understand this situation clearly a brief review of the relations between Denmark and the two duchies is necessary.

The duchies had a mixed population of Germans and Danes, and since the year 1459 had separately had as their duke the King of Denmark, who by a charter granted in 1460 had recognized the separate status and administration of each. This charter was faithfully adhered to until the middle of the Nineteenth Century. The spirit of nationalism, a dominant force in that century, stirred the Danes at the same time it was revolutionizing other parts of Europe. In 1846, the King of Denmark, contrary to the ancient charter of the duchies, arbitrarily decreed that the connection between the duchies and the Danish ruler should continue, despite the different

laws of inheritance in the two countries. However, nothing serious resulted. About two years later a more offensive move was made when a new king declared the annexation of Schleswig, the northern province, to Denmark. Fired with the determination to preserve their ancient charter, which among other things provided for their inseparable union, both duchies rose in revolt. To further complicate matters, Holstein, the southern province, predominantly German in population, was an inseparable member of the Germanic Confederation. At that very moment the German states were in the throes of revolution, and a national assembly had been called at Frankfurt, which was giving vent to the long repressed liberal and nationalistic sentiment of the Germans. Sympathy in the German assembly, of course, was with the duchies, and troops of Prussia and the German confederacy were sent to assist them. German land victories were matched by Danish successes on the sea, and finally through the influence of Great Britain and Russia, Sweden was allowed to mediate. A truce was arranged in August 1848, but no one was satisfied with its provisions, and fighting was renewed between Denmark and Prussia in February 1849. Great Britain, Russia, and Sweden again worked for peace. At length, in July 1849, a second truce was arranged, whereby Schleswig was occupied in the north by Swedish troops and in the south by Prussians and received a new administration. On the basis of this truce a definitive peace having been made, Prussian officers were

withdrawn from service in the duchies. Dissatisfied with the peace, the duchies continued hostilities. In the summer of 1850, the Danes advanced into Schleswig, but were checked. Neither side was able to advance. This was the situation existing at the time of the Frankfort Congress, August 22-24.

On the third day of the Frankfort Congress, Dr. Bodenstedt of Berlin, a man of considerable literary reputation and a prominent liberal in Prussian politics, appeared at the Congress with a document signed by all the leading men of the constitutional party at Berlin, as well as the ambassador of the duchies at Berlin, urging the Congress to appoint a commission to inquire into the Schleswig-Holstein controversy with the object of bringing a settlement by arbitration. This request, however, ran counter to a rule of the Congress which forbade the discussion of current political topics. So anxious had been the Berlin friends of Dr. Bodenstedt that the matter should be laid before the Congress that they had telegraphed Richard on the night of August 23, asking that the sittings be prolonged a few hours in case Bodenstedt did not arrive in time.

Joseph Sturge, Elihu Burritt and Henry Richard were greatly moved by this urgent appeal and began to consider the possibility of a private mission to the warring countries. Furthermore, Sturge received communications from two different influential sources urging him to engage in the

undertaking. One of the letters stated that Dr. Bodenstedt assured the writer on good authority that the leading men of the duchies would gladly welcome a private party of Englishmen, and members of the Peace Society, in the capacity of mediators. He further advised Sturge before undertaking such a mission to interview Herr von Stegman, ambassador for the duchies at Frankfort, who would give him the necessary information and letters of introduction. Afterwards, the delegates should proceed to Berlin, there to meet the ambassador of the Duchies and other influential persons who would aid the mission in every way possible.

On August 28, Sturge, Burritt, Richard, and Dr. Varrentrapp, German secretary of the Frankfort Congress, visited Von Stegman, who heartily approved the project and sought to
(45)
promote it. Because of business concerning the Peace Society, Richard was forced to return to London, but Sturge and Burritt, joined by Frederick Wheeler, undertook the mission, arriving at Berlin, August 31. There Dr. Bodenstedt, accompanied by Von Holzendorff, Attorney-General of Prussia, called on them at their hotel. Holzendorff seemed much in-
(46)
terested in the undertaking. Others who joined in this interview were Baron Sillencron, the Berlin ambassador for the duchies, and Professor Torchhammer of Kiel. The whole subject of the mission was discussed. While in Berlin, the three peace missionaries received letters of introduction and directions for the trip from various sources. On the eve of

their departure for Kiel, September 2, they drew up a statement of their views and objects in order to prevent misunderstanding and misrepresentation of their mission. By the request of Siliencron they were joined at Altona by Professor Worms of Hamburg, a man well acquainted with all the leading governmental officials of the duchies, and also familiar with the issues involved in the controversy. They drew up a "manifesto" at Kiel, for presentation to the two stadtholders and other members of the government of the duchies. They also called on prominent local officials who unanimously approved the object of their mission. They next proceeded to Rendsburg, the principal fortress of Holstein, and the seat of the executive of the duchies' government. Here in an interview with the stadtholders they presented their manifesto and explained it. Added weight to the argument for arbitration in the case was given by the fact that in a treaty of alliance between Denmark and the duchies made originally in 1533, renewed in 1623, and confirmed at Travendall in 1700, there was this provision:

"With respect to any differences that might arise between them, they agree to adjust them not by means of arms, but by means of councillors, constituted as arbitrators, on the part of each, and disengaged from their oath of allegiance." (45)

The stadtholders, the foreign minister, and minister of war, declared "they would be willing to refer the claims of the duchies to the decision of enlightened and impartial arbitrators, provided that Denmark would also refer its claims

to the same tribunal, reserving for eventual arrangement the appointment, composition, and jurisdiction of the court of arbitrators." Before leaving Rendsburg, the mission drew up a paper containing what they had understood was the position of the officials of the duchies, whose approval it received. Concerning the Rendsburg visit, Sturge wrote Richard, "I wish you could have been with us; it seemed a day of triumph for our principles." The deputation returned to Kiel, and from there proceeded to Swinemunde, where they took a steamer for Copenhagen.

On September 11, the delegation interviewed Count Molcke, Prime Minister of Denmark. They reported the success of their operations at Rendsburg and cited the treaty binding the parties to arbitration. All three members addressed the Prime Minister, but the speech of Sturge was especially effective. The minister assured them of his desire for peace and expressed interest in the method which they suggested. He seemed moved by their visit, but intimated that the final decision rested with the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Herr De Reedtz. The party also had an interview with Professor David, who was greatly concerned with the successful outcome of their object, and who promised them he would see the Prime Minister and probably the Minister of Foreign Affairs before their interview with the latter that evening.

At the appointed hour, the deputation waited on Herr De Reedtz at his hotel. They found that he had read the

"manifesto" which they had presented to the Prime Minister. Before giving them an official statement he explained that he had once retired from active life to take up his preferred work as a scientist, but had accepted his present position in the hope that he could bring about peace between the Danes and the Schleswig-Holsteiners. Thrice he had entered into negotiations for that purpose but had failed. He declared to the mission that he was willing to make any reasonable sacrifice to obtain peace. Then, after having heard the arguments of the deputation in behalf of their proposal, he assured them that his government was disposed to concede even a part of her just claims rather than have the war continue. He promised to take the matter up with the cabinet and to report to the delegates if there was anything to communicate.

The next day, the delegates saw Professor David again. He had dined with the ministers the preceding day, and reported that the Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs had had a long conversation apparently devoted to the arbitration proposal. David left them to go directly to De Reedtz, and an hour or so later they received a communication from the latter asking them to call at his hotel at nine in the morning. Meanwhile the American minister had shown himself very friendly and helpful to the delegation in numerous ways, and had helped to entertain them by showing them various places of interest in and around Copenhagen. (45)

De Reedtz in the next interview with the delegation in-

formed them that the Danish Government could not officially accept the proposed mode of settlement, yet it did not reject it. He asked that the proposal be forwarded to the Government, and assured them that it would be immediately considered, "with every disposition toward its acceptance, and without being tenacious as to the form in which, or the channel through which, it might be forwarded." (45)

Wheeler and Sturge now returned to Kiel, but Burritt awaited further action in Copenhagen. Communicating with De Reedtz through Professor David, Burritt at length succeeded in getting the recognition of the Danish Government to the arbitration principle in the same shape that the duchies had sanctioned. On September 23 the full deputation conferred with the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the duchies, who authorized a plan of arbitration in line with the treaty arrangement between the two countries. Sturge and Wheeler now returned to England, but Burritt consented to stay in Hamburg for a few weeks to facilitate and expedite the preliminary negotiations. (47)

Both governments went so far as to appoint a sort of unofficial negotiator on each side; Professor David for Denmark and Professor Samwer for the duchies. They were to decide the questions concerning the character and constitution of the proposed court of arbitration. At this juncture, Chevalier Bunsen, Prussian ambassador to England, declared to Cobden that he had a stronger hope of success crowning the

unskilled efforts of the deputation than from all the steps that had yet been taken by the professional diplomats. Toward the close of September 1850, the deputation wrote an extended account of their negotiations for the Herald of Peace, in which appears this statement;

"....If such an arrangement be not now effected, we believe it will be mainly attributable to the interference of the great European powers, contrary to the wish of one of the contending parties..
..."

Outside interference was exactly the thing which wrecked the plans that were well under way for the settlement of the dispute by arbitration. Prussia, late in October 185-, sent a representative to act as mediator, but too late. Austria, ever opposed to revolt because of her own subject peoples, had just succeeded in restoring the Germanic Confederation thereby regaining her influence over the Germanies. She dispatched an official to Kiel with a manifesto announcing that unless hostilities on the part of the duchies ceased at once, troops of the German Confederation would be sent in. About this same time, Prussia, threatened with more internal difficulties ordered her volunteers home. At Olmutz, a few days later, she suffered one of the bitterest diplomatic humiliations that history records. Among other things Prussia was forced to agree that Schleswig-Holstein should be delivered to the Danes. Holstein was occupied by Austrian troops, with Prussian consent, and was later handed over to Denmark. The Treaty of London of May 8, 1852, and the Protocol, signed by

the five great powers and Sweden, guaranteed the integrity of the Danish monarchy by regulating the succession for the crown of Denmark and for the duchies, but the latter were
(49)
not consulted in the matter.

Thus the professional diplomats healed over the surface of a sore, which eleven years later was to fester again and infect Central Europe. The results of the revived Schleswig-Holstein question of the '60's are momentous. It brought war between Denmark on one hand and Austria and Prussia on the other. Quarrels over the gains of this war precipitated the Austro-Prussian War of 1866; and in turn helped to bring on the Franco-Prussian War four years later. The Franco-Prussian War, by dismembering France, helped to pave the way for the World War. Thus one may trace a course of disaster growing out of this diplomatic fumbling. If the arbitration machinery which was being erected at the time of Austria's intervention had been given a chance to operate between the two powers immediately concerned, is it not likely, since both were anxious to reach a settlement, that they would have agreed on a solution mutually acceptable, which would have precluded any occasion for further difficulties?

While the Schleswig-Holstein mission is of importance in showing the increasing influence of the peace men and interesting from the standpoint of what might have been accomplished, neither it nor any other achievement of the pioneer peace societies can be compared with the great tangible gain

made in 1856 at the Congress of Paris which closed the Crimean War.

Historians of today regard the Crimean War, 1853-56, as one of the most useless and unjustifiable wars of recent times. Ostensibly it grew out of difficulties between Russia and France, and between Russia and Turkey over the protection of Christians in the Holy Land. Not only did it involve these countries, but Great Britain and Sardinia as well, and threatened to draw in even others. Great Britain felt that her interests in India demanded that she keep Russia out of the Straits. Sardinia, under the leadership of the far-sighted Cavour, entered the war to gain friends and prestige. Napoleon III of France was bidding for the popularity of his subjects and for French preeminence on the Continent. Nicholas I, Tsar of Russia, wished to drive "the sick man" from Europe, and to take a prominent part in the division of his possessions. The military events of the war were focused chiefly in the Crimean Peninsula, where the enemies of Russia struggled about a year at tremendous cost in life and money to capture the fortress of Sebastopol. This accomplished, 1855, Napoleon III was ready to cease hostilities, but the English court, feeling that the British military reputation had not been sufficiently redeemed, felt that at least another expedition should be undertaken. Austria, a neutral, presented an ultimatum to Russia, stipulating the basis upon which negotiations would proceed, and Russia and England reluctantly consented to a Peace Congress.

The Peace Congress of Paris sat during the period February 25 to April 1. Count Walewski, an illegitimate son of Napoleon I, and Foreign Minister of France, was made president of the Congress. The British representatives were Lord Clarendon and Lord Cowley, nephew of the Duke of Wellington, and ambassador to Paris. The arrogant Count Buol-Schauenstein, Premier and Minister of Foreign Affairs, was Austria's chief representative. Russia sent Count Orloff, a soldier of the Napoleonic wars, characterized by his naivité, and Baron Brunnow, a bureaucrat. Sardinia was represented by the Cavour, who did most of his work outside the sessions of the Congress. Grand Vizier Ali Pasha, a man with western training, was the chief Turkish delegate. The Prussian members of the Congress, Baron Otto Manteuffel and Count Max Hatzfeldt, were not invited to sit in until almost at its close, and were not allowed to discuss the work previously handled. So mild was the treatment dealt out to Russia by the Treaty of Paris, that Baron Bourqueney, the lesser French representative, said of it, "Quand vous lisez ce Traité, vous vous demandez quel
(50)
est le vaincu, quel est le vainqueur?"

After signing the peace treaty, the Congress continued its sessions for two weeks longer, discussing various things. During this period a clash occurred between Buol and Cavour, in which Cavour warned the Congress that Europe would not enjoy real peace until Italy's wrongs were redressed. The Austrian representatives protested against the attack and sought to have it expunged from the record of the protocol,

but failed. In this period also was adopted the famous Declaration of Paris, at the instance of Walewski, which added four important rules to the body international maritime law. However important all these points may be, this study is more concerned with still another protocol adopted by the Congress of Paris.

British pacifists who had bitterly opposed the Crimean War, as will be seen in the next chapter, were determined not to allow such a favorable opportunity as the meeting at Paris to pass without attempting to secure international recognition of the arbitration principle. Invitations were sent to several prominent men known to be favorable to the project, asking them to join a deputation to wait on Lord Palmerston, the Prime Minister. On March 14, a delegation of fifty-eight members from the Peace Congress Committee of London and Manchester, interviewed Palmerston at his home. (51) Included in this delegation were eighteen members of Parliament, among whom were Gibson, Grosvenor, Cobden, Hindley, Miall, and Ewart. Joseph Sturge and Henry Richard were also present.

Milner Gibson introduced the party, and Henry Richard read a lengthy memorial which asked

"....that, at least, a provision might be introduced into the treaty of peace which, they trust, is about to be concluded, binding their respective Governments to refer such misunderstandings as may hereafter arise between any of them, on the questions to which the treaty relates to the decision of an impartial arbitrator....."

Lord Grosvenor, who had supported the Government during the war, and who did not agree with all the sentiments contained in the address, urged Palmerston to support the adoption of some definite arrangement in regard to arbitration at the Congress of Paris. Palmerston was very civil, but offered no encouragement that the Government would take such action. He agreed to the principle in the abstract, and held that though it worked between individuals in the same community, it did not follow that it would work equally well in international relations, "because it was nearly impossible to find arbitrators who might be considered to have no interest in the question at issue." He referred to the American rejection of the award of the King of the Netherlands in the case of the Maine boundary. It was Cobden's contention that the British Government had virtually recognized the principle in the recent Fisheries Treaty (1854) with America. Palmerston agreed that it was the duty of the Government to use arbitration in minor matters, but not when "great questions of national rights or advantages were involved".

Thus, having received little encouragement from the Prime Minister, Henry Richard insisted that the opportunity was too great to let pass without a further attempt to secure international action on arbitration. He advocated that a delegation should proceed to Paris and there put the project before the plenipotentiaries themselves. Many opposed the idea through fear of ridicule, but characteristically Joseph Sturge replied to Richard, "Thou art right, if no

(52)

one else will go with thee, I will." Shortly after the middle of March, Sturge and Richard went to Paris, where they were joined by Charles Hindley. Here they drew up and sent a memorial to the various plenipotentiaries of the Congress. This memorial asked for practically the same thing as the previous one to Palmerston, namely, that in the treaty of peace there should be a clause providing for the reference of any disputes arising thereafter among the signatory powers, on the questions to which the treaty related, to an impartial umpirage. Count Walewski and Count Cavour replied favorably to the memorial, but the reply of the Prussian delegates was especially cordial, stating that their King "expressly wished them to support" the proposition. Meanwhile the delegation held several personal conferences with various plenipotentiaries in behalf of their project. (53)

To receive approvals was one thing, but to secure the actual introduction of the subject in a session of the Congress was another. This problem was a most serious one, and in their dilemma the delegation turned to Clarendon, who seemed to be their only hope. Richard recorded in his diary an account of the interview with Cobden at his hotel. (52) "He received us with great courtesy and frankness", Richard noted. Richard explained to Clarendon that he was the most suitable person to propose at the conference "the introduction of an arbitration clause in the new treaty", and further asserted that the "principle had already been fully recognized in the treaty on the Fisheries question between

Great Britain and the United States. This had been made under the direction of Clarendon himself. Clarendon replied that it was very desirable that nations should find a substitute for war. Frequently differences were too trivial to justify a single day of warfare. However, he stated that there were such things as national dignity and honor. If these, he felt, were not protected, a country could expect to be bullied. Here Richard recorded, "We could not restrain a smile at the use of this last expression. He observed it, and laughed very heartily himself." The difficulty of inducing the governments to bind themselves to arbitration before a case arose, was suggested by Clarendon. Richard, on the other hand, argued that such a practice would prevent differences from becoming too tense for pacific settlement. "The shrug of the shoulders and the shaking of the head, and the uplifting of hands and eyebrows, with which he signified his appreciation of this remark, was quite a study." He repeated still, that it would be difficult to persuade governments to bind themselves to arbitrate future differences, but he added, "I will do what I can".

It is possible that Clarendon's promise to do what he could for arbitration at the Paris Congress came partly from a desire to assert the independence of his views from those of Palmerston, who had given the friends of peace no encouragement. Divergence of policy existed throughout the negotiations between the Prime Minister at London and the Foreign Minister acting as Plenipotentiary at Paris. At the out-

(54)

set, Palmerston had opposed Clarendon's going to Paris. Once the Congress had opened, Palmerston closely followed its proceedings, making frequent suggestions to Clarendon, who considered he had full competence to act for himself at the Congress. How Clarendon reacted to this meddling from the Premier is indicated in the following letters to Lord Granville. On March 8, Clarendon wrote the latter,

".... I was rather provoked by some of Palmerston's first dispatches and telegrams, as I didn't want to know what Russia was to be told or what she had accepted and must consequently do; but as luckily I am old enough to walk alone, you may suppose they do not embarrass me much." (55)

Four days later, he wrote as follows,

"....The Emperor to this day has not got over Palmerston's letter to Persigny saying we were quite able to carry on the war alone with the aid of Sardinia and Turkey".....It was nonsense to write to me what Russia ought to do. However, as you may suppose, they made no impression upon me beyond a little momentary irritation, and I have taken no notice of any of them in my public dispatches."(55)

A large part of the session of the Congress on April 14, was given over to a discussion of arbitration. The report of the meeting is found in Protocol 23 of the proceedings of the Paris Congress. Clarendon asked leave of the Congress to submit the question of arbitration, which he felt was timely, inasmuch as war was still fresh in the minds of all. He mentioned the fact that Article 7 of the treaty which had just been made recommended the mediation of a friendly power in case future disagreements should arise between Turkey and one of the signatories of the treaty, Clarendon suggested that this "happy innovation" should receive a more gen-

(56)

eral application. Then he proposed that the assembled plenipotentiaries agree upon a resolution calculated to maintain peace, without prejudicing the independence of governments. Walewski declared himself authorized to support such a resolution, "it being fully in accordance with the tendencies of the epoch", provided it did not fetter the free action

(56)

of governments. The chief Austrian representative, Buol, stated that he was ready to support the proposition in the form indicated by Walewski. Clarendon assured the assembly that it was not his intention to limit the authority of governments, but that he merely wished to give them an opportunity to settle their disputes by a different means than war. Baron Manteuffel adhered, Count Orloff, however, while admitting the wisdom of the proposal, stated that before agreeing, he would first have to seek the opinion of his Court. The question was next raised by Cavour whether the author of the proposal intended that it should be extended to military intervention against defacto governments, and by way of example referred to Austrian intervention in the Kingdom of Naples in 1821. To this, Clarendon answered that "the will of the Congress should admit the most general application", and Walewski added that it was not a question of stipulating a law or taking an engagement. The "wish" expressed by the Congress could not limit the liberty of judgment of a power in questions concerning its honor. Count Buol rose to defend Austrian intervention in Naples, previously referred to by Cavour. He felt that if in the future

similar action should be agreed upon by the five great Powers, their operations should not become the object of remonstrance by the lesser Powers. While he agreed to the proposition as expressed by Clarendon, he could not consent to too great an extension of the principle, such as the favoring of de facto governments. Buol hoped "that the Congress, at the very moment of closing its work, would not see itself obliged to deal with irritating questions of such a nature as to trouble the perfect harmony which had not ceased to reign among the plenipotentiaries." Cavour declared himself satisfied with the explanation given, and adhered. Thereupon, the following resolution was passed:

"The plenipotentiaries do not hesitate to express, in the name of their Governments, the wish that states between which any serious misunderstandings may arise, should, before appealing to arms, have recourse, so far as circumstances might allow, to the good offices of a friendly power.

"The plenipotentiaries hope that the Governments not represented at the congress will unite in the sentiment which has inspired the wish recorded in the present protocol." (56)

Thus was the principle of general mediation first endorsed by a Congress of the Powers. Its origin, as has been shown, was within the Peace Society. This was the crowning triumph of their labors.

Despite the fact that the Congress of Paris did not go to the extent which peace men desired, nevertheless, it took a halfstep toward arbitration. Mediation differs from good offices in that the latter may be accepted without confer-

ring the right of mediation, which permits a state, when invited, to intercede amicably in arranging the differences (57) between two or more states. Mediation and arbitration differ in that the former is advisory and merely recommends a solution for a difficulty, whereas the latter is a judicial (58) function and decides on an award.

Inasmuch as Protocol 23 lay outside the Declaration of the Congress of Paris, separate adhesion by other than the signatory powers was necessary. Subsequently it was ratified by thirty non-signatory states, including eighteen of the German States, four of the Italian States, Greece, Portugal, Sweden-Norway, the Argentine Republic, Brazil, and Columbia, Denmark. The United States, however, did not act (59) in the matter.

This "happy innovation", to quote Clarendon, contemporaneously received the approval of several leading statesmen of the day. Gladstone said of it,

"As to the proposal to submit international differences to arbitration, I think that is in itself a very great triumph, a powerful engine in behalf of civilization and humanity. It is, perhaps, the first time that the representatives of the principal nations of Europe have given an emphatic utterance to sentiments which contain, at least, a qualified disapproval of a resort to war, and asserted the supremacy of reason, of justice, and religion." (60)

The Earl of Derby, on a subsequent occasion, referred to it as

"the principle which, to its endless honour, was embodied in the protocols by the Conference of Paris." (60)

Another laudatory opinion was expressed by the Earl of Mal-

mesbury, who held it was an act

"....of the most importance to civilization and to the security of the peace of Europe", because, "it recognized and established the immortal truth, that time, by giving place for reason to operate, is as much a preventative as a healer of hostilities." (60)

Mr. Denison said in the House of Commons,

"it throws around peace an additional bulwark, and sets a landmark in the progress of civilization and humanity". (61)

And what were the newspapers saying meanwhile? "The Empire" regarding this discussion significantly commented:

"True, indeed, that the contracting Powers have refused to bind themselves to refer the disputes that may hereafter arise between them to the judgment of a friendly and impartial umpire. But we must remember that the question was almost entirely new to the diplomatic mind; and considering how completely the members of that profession are the slaves of precedent and routine, we cannot but count it an immense gain to have induced them so far to emerge out of the traditional ruts, and to accept, in however modified a form, what Lord Clarendon calls, 'this happy innovation'. They have recognized, in a calm and deliberate manner, the principle of a moral reference in the affairs of nations. They have taken arbitration out of the region of abstract speculation, and included it among the recognized resources of practical statesmanship. But we must expect, according to our past experience in such matters, that the long and earnest struggles of the Peace party to press this measure on the attention of Governments, will be overlooked and ignored, and that other parties, who have never shared in the conflict will step in complacently to usurp the laurels. Mr. Denison did indeed make a generous reference, in connexion with the subject of arbitration, to Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright. Otherwise their names, and those of the men who have been associated with them in this enterprise, have been carefully eschewed....."

"The Times" which had habitually belittled the Peace Society and its activities, expressed the following sentiments:

"Though this be only a principle of common humanity, such as must naturally occur in every ordinary statesman, yet its express recognition by a European Congress gives it more weight, and constitutes the ground of an appeal by every state from any other state that disregards it. It makes all Europe one court of appeal. It gives every weak state a claim to the friendly offices of all its stronger neighbours. Indeed, it is the nearest approach to that system of universal arbitration which some have thought attainable in its rigorous form. The day may come when its value will be more acknowledged, and its form more defined; and the sooner it comes the better for the happiness of Europe and the true interests of every state, however powerful and ambitious."

Opinions of the contemporary press and statesmen on Protocol 23 have been noted. Has History justified them? The true significance of this resolution lies not in the actual disputes settled on by virtue of it, but in the precedent which it established. It was the first of a series of international acts which have led to world-wide countenance of the principle of arbitration, and the development of machinery to facilitate its application. It has been affirmed that in several disputes subsequent to 1856, neutral states, citing Protocol 23, offered their good offices to the contestants, but in no case did the contestants themselves ask a neutral to propose mediation. That is not to say, however, that mediation was not used in the period following the Congress of Paris, for the Austro-Prussian War of 1866, that between Chile and her neighbors Bolivia and Peru, and the war between Greece and Turkey in 1897, were settled by the mediation of neutral powers. The British Government, appealing specifically to Protocol 23, offered her good offices without success to Prussia and Austria in 1866, and again to Prussia and France in 1870. In the latter case the

French Government replied that it recognized the usefulness of the rule, but that it did not apply in "questions qui touchent à sa dignité", as in the present case. (62)

The mediation principle was reaffirmed in 1885 at the Congo Congress at Berlin, but the First Hague Conference of 1899, went far beyond mediation, and established the Permanent Court of International Arbitration. At the opening of this Conference, M. Feodor Martens, a Russian statesman who had consistently worked for the calling of the meeting, submitted a number of papers on subjects to be considered there. Among these documents was one dealing with good offices, mediation, and international commissions of inquiry, in which Protocol 23 was cited as a precedent in the development of international recognition of the principle of Arbitration. In this way the action of the Congress of Paris is definitely connected with the First Hague Conference. (62)

This international recognition of the mediation principle marked the climax of the activities of the Pioneer Peace Movement. During the period of the '40's and '50's they had worked diligently to secure official adoption of their principles, meeting mostly with failure, but winning here and there a triumph. Their successes for the most part had been moral rather than material in nature. Meanwhile forces were at work which were to impair the influence of the Peace Societies, but happily not until some of it had been well established.

CHAPTER V

RISE AND TRIUMPH OF THE WAR SPIRIT.

The preceding chapter has shown how rapid was the rise of the influence of the peace movement after the first international peace convention of 1843. On the whole the following ten-year period had been a peaceful one, in which pacifism had met with little determined opposition. By 1841 the membership of the peace societies had reached the 40,000 mark, but those outside of the regular membership who were willing to support all or a part of the pacifist program were numbered by the hundred thousands⁽¹⁾. Peace men had ceased to be regarded by most serious minded persons as fit subjects for ridicule. Their proposals - more practical than formerly, it is true - no longer appeared to be so Utopian. Respectable statesmen were coming forward as champions of various parts of their program. A deepening sense of the enormity of war was developing on all sides, and a mutual respect and good will, fostered by the economic conditions of the age, were developing as never before. Such success was attending their efforts that it seemed to many that the long-talked of millennium could not be very distant. What, then, occurred to prevent the fulfillment of these hopes?

Before the Pioneer Peace Movement had yet reached its climax, obstacles had begun to impede the velocity of its progress. During the period between the Napoleonic and

Crimean wars, Europe bore the burden of large standing armaments. Some countries, notably Austria, with her heterogeneous population, felt the need of a large armed force to insure herself against internal revolts. Consequently all her neighbors likewise felt that arms were necessary to keep pace with Austria. The situation was particularly grievous inasmuch as most of the countries had had heavy debts incurred in the Napoleonic wars. The resulting tax-burden was an important element in the internal unrest so noticeable among the European countries during the early half of the Nineteenth Century.

Even England, in her isolated position, and with her commanding navy, took steps occasionally to increase her military establishments. In 1834 and 1835, Urquhart in parliament, aided by a portion of the press, strove to alarm the English nation with the prospect that Russia was about to annihilate Turkey. They succeeded in gaining an increase in armaments.⁽²⁾ England and France, during the period of the Orleanist monarchy, were until toward its close, ostensibly friends. Traditional enmity between them, however, gave birth to new suspicions and jealousies, and the '40's especially witnessed a series of petty misunderstandings, which has aptly given the name "entente pin-pricks" to the relations of the two countries in that period. There were differences over Mehemet Ali, the Khedive of Egypt, and over Tahiti in the South Pacific, but especially disturbing was the question of the Spanish

marriages, which in 1846, dispelled the pretense of cordial relations, and not until the revolution of 1848, with its new government, the Second Republic, were more friendly relations restored. Whenever a tension developed the press and war party of each country proceeded to make the most of the controversy.

In the closing months of Sir Robert Peel's second premiership, (1846), the Duke of Wellington, who, in justice it must be said, was sincerely alarmed, sent repeated warnings to the Government in regard to the condition of the national defense. While he favored the continuance of friendly relations with France he expressed grave doubt as to whether or not Louis Philippe could long control the situation there because of the belligerent tone of the French press. (3) However, the parliamentary session of 1846 was so taken up with the anti-Corn Law agitation that the Peel ministry fell without attempting to strengthen the defenses of the country. Wellington was on close terms with Lord John Russell, the new Premier (1846-52), whom he at once began to urge to champion increased armaments. In his agitation, Wellington had an able assistant in Lord Palmerston, who strongly advocated at least increased defense of the southern coast. He maintained that steam had bridged the Channel, and he even had visions of the French catching England unawares and landing large forces on her shores. Palmerston sent memorials to the Premier repeatedly demanding an increase in the coast defense, and the organization of a militia. Lord Minto,

Russell's father-in-law, and Lord Auckland, First Lord of the Admiralty, shared to some degree the alarms of Wellington and Palmerston. On the other hand Sir Charles Wood, Chancellor of the Exchequer, felt that the condition of the country's finances, the depression of trade at that time, and the Irish famine were situations vastly more real and dangerous.⁽³⁾

The character of this agitation is seen in the following excerpts taken from letters exchanged during the period.

Palmerston in August of 1847 wrote Russell as follows;

"....The French will be sure anyhow to know exactly what we are about, for they keep a sharp look out, and within the last two months they have had some of their war steamers lying for a week or ten days at a time in different parts of the Thames under pretence of taking in coals, but no doubt to see what we are doing at Tilbury and elsewhere in the way of defensive works, and probably also to take surroundings...."(3)

In the following month, Wellington wrote the Prime Minister;

"....But we must get forward with these works (the fortification of the Channel Isles) and above all we must immediately take care of Alderney! Indeed I am so jealous and anxious upon this subject and so suspicious of our ambitions and enterprising neighbor that I propose to communicate with the Secretary of State as soon as he will return, with a view to send force there to make it certain that a coup de main shall not be struck there."(3)

Palmerston wrote Russell again in December;

"....The danger is that within a week after a rupture with France we may find thirty to forty thousand French regular troops landed on our coast...."(3)

Calmer views were held by Fox-Maule, Secretary of War, and Sir Charles Wood. The former in a letter of January 3, 1848, to Russell, stated;

"I shall not enter upon any detailed observation on his (Wellington's) memorandum, but I cannot forbear from giving my opinion that the Duke points at a much larger increase to our standing army than my views of what is strictly constitutional would warrant or that the House of Commons would sanction, even were the Ministry to propose it. Moreover I very much doubt whether such an increase from no very apparent cause would not -- and not unreasonably -- excite the jealousy of foreign Powers and bring on those very events which it is the general desire of all to avert." (3)

Sir Charles Wood two days later wrote the Prime Minister as follows;

"....I am not one of those who are so very apprehensive of an actual descent on our shores. People have got into the habit of talking of the landing of the French on the Sussex coast as a circumstance to be expected, almost as a matter of course. I certainly think that the facility of such an operation is being much over-rated...." (3)

There was no opportunity during the session of 1847 to bring forward a militia bill, but at the close of the session, Lord John Russell submitted such a proposition to his ministry, and during the ensuing recess its various aspects were discussed. Fox-Maule asked for fewer in the proposed militia, while Palmerston demanded more.

The anxieties of the Government became public when, at the opening of the session of 1848, a letter from Wellington to Sir John Burgoyne, Inspector-General of Fortifications, found its way into print. The letter stated that "except under the fire of Dover Castle there was not a spot from North Foreland to Selsey Bill where infantry might not land, at any time, with any wind, in any weather" (3). This letter from the revered old war-lord of England produced a veritable panic. In order to meet the situation, Lord John

Russell produced a more elaborate scheme that he had originally planned, calling for an increase in the army, navy, and ordnance estimates, and for the application of £150,000 for a militia force. To cover the deficit which this would entail, he proposed to increase the income tax from 7d to a shilling.⁽³⁾

Before the opening of Parliament, the Peace Society had heard rumors of the Government's intention, and at once issued a general address to the English people urging them to petition Parliament for a decrease in the existing establishments, and a law providing for the settlement of international disputes by arbitration. It continued,

"....Let such petitions be adopted everywhere, and be poured into the House so soon as it shall re-assemble. Let the whole matter be thoroughly canvassed in all quarters, and let the Friends of Peace hold themselves in readiness to persevere in a firm and decided opposition to the whole scheme, until it be entirely abandoned.

"Morality, benevolence, religion, all call us to prompt and united action. MEET AT ONCE AND PETITION!"⁽⁴⁾

A special "National Defense Committee" in the Peace Society, instigated by Joseph Sturge, met January 4 and a week later to draw up a memorial to the Government of Great Britain. This, they presented January 13. It asked that

"immediate steps be taken to provide for the settlement of all future differences with foreign powers, which cannot be arranged by negotiation, by a system of arbitration, by the establishment of a Congress of Nations, the erection of a High Court of Judicature, or by such other means as shall upon mature deliberation be deemed suitable and expedient".⁽⁴⁾

Meetings, many of which adopted friendly addresses to the French people, were held all over the country. Usually they framed a petition to Parliament protesting against increased armaments. The net result of the opposition was to secure a withdrawal of the proposed militia bill. While the influence of the Peace Society must have been great, undoubtedly still greater factors were the strong opposition to the increase in the income tax, necessitated by increased armaments, and the February Revolution which overthrew the Orleans dynasty in France, substituting the Second Republic. The military estimates of 1849, the following year, were the lowest since 1841, indicating a complete recovery from the first invasion panic.⁽³⁾

The immediate effect of the creation of the new republic in France was to arouse mild alarm in England, where memories of the excesses of the First French Republic was remembered. This feeling, moreover, was not lessened by Lamartine's circular letter early sent abroad to French representatives, stating that the treaties of 1815 were not so sacrosanct. Palmerston, however, welcomed the overthrow of the Orleanist monarchy, with which Great Britain had been on openly unfriendly terms for about a year. When Lamartine assured Wellington of his good intentions, English suspicions were calmed, and a period of peaceful relations seemed at hand.

Palmerston, however, continued to take fright at shadows. On April 26, 1848, he wrote Russell,

"....A procession of 300,000 or even of 200,000 armed men in Paris augurs but ill for the future peace of Europe. I trust that we may be able to keep out of war, but there can be no doubt that there exists in France a feeling of hostility to England." (5)

The Don Pacifico affair assumed in 1850, alarming possibilities. During the Easter celebration of 1847 at Athens, a mob sacked the house of one Don Pacifico, a Portuguese Jew born on the Island of Malta, and hence a British subject. Palmerston supported his extravagant claim for indemnity, but for more than two years it went unredressed. In January, 1850, a British admiral was ordered to Piraeus. There he gave the Greek Government forty-eight hours in which to settle the claim. When the Greek Government was not forthcoming with the indemnity, the admiral seized about forty Greek merchant ships. Paris and St. Petersburg indignantly heard of this high handed procedure, and the Russian ambassador at London demanded an explanation. The French, who offered mediation, drafted a convention which Palmerston accepted. In spite of this he violated the spirit of the agreement, and the French Government recalled its ambassador from London. The House of Lords passed a vote of censure against Palmerston. However, Mr. Roebuck on June 28, in the House of Commons moved that his conduct in the handling of foreign affairs be approved. In the ensuing debate, Palmerston's whole foreign policy was reviewed. Peel, Gladstone, Disraeli, Sir James Graham, and Cobden all opposed it. Palmerston, however, defended himself very ably in a five-hour speech, which com-

manded the admiration even of his enemies. He was supported by Cockburn. The issue involved was whether the British Foreign Office in its dealings with other countries should adopt politic and conciliatory means or use violence and armed force. Palmerston won the victory, being sustained by a majority of forty-six votes. The issue, however, was confused with suspicion of French diplomatic conspiracy and the belief that a protectionist intrigue was at work. It must be said that Palmerston was pretty generally supported by public opinion. The victory of Palmerston was a decided triumph for the policies which ran counter to the ideals of the peace party. The full effects of his triumph remained to be experienced.⁽⁶⁾

Palmerston continued to harass Lord Russell with his alarmist letters. Early in February 1850, he sent this note;

"This report about the fortifications made at Alexandria by Mehemet Ali and Ibrahim under French direction, in order to make Egypt tenable by a French army in case of war, is worthy of your attention; not merely as an evidence of the designs of France in that quarter, but as an example not to be overlooked with reference to our own home." (7)

In May of that year, he forwarded Russell a memorandum on England's poor land defenses by Sir John Burgoyne, with an accompanying letter urging an increase for the country's safety.⁽⁸⁾ Another typical letter was sent to the Premier in September, running as follows;

"This Cherbourg Review and the insight which it has afforded into the means which France has of attacking us ought, I think, to impress upon you the urgency of not delaying those further measures which are neces-

sary to secure our dockyards from destruction by surprise. Cherbourg is not above a hundred miles from Portsmouth or a hundred and fifty from Plymouth, and any description of force, naval and military, which a French Government might chuse (sic) to send out could start from thence at nightfall without the possibility of our having a previous notice, and would by sunrise be ready to land troops on our coast.....Make your hay while the sun shines, and prepare your defences while you are at peace...."(7)

Palmerston's handling of the Foreign Office was almost as aggressive as his letters were alarming. The Queen and the Prince Consort, who felt that England should be exerting a calm influence over the troublous politics of the Continent were distinctly displeased. In December of 1851, Palmerston was dismissed from office ostensibly for having stated an opinion favoring Louis Napoleon's coup d'etat of December 2, (9) contrary to the Government's decision to adopt a neutral stand. Soon after Palmerston's dismissal, Prince Albert wrote to Lord John Russell, stating that England's

"influence has been rendered null by Lord Palmerston's personal manner of conducting the foreign affairs, and by the universal hatred which he has excited on the Continent. That you could hope to control him has long been doubted by us, and its impossibility is clearly proved by the last proceedings. I can only congratulate you that the opportunity of the rupture should have been one in which all the right is on your side."(9)

Palmerston, however, in a letter to his brother, January 1852, explained in detail the circumstances of his dismissal, and declared;

".....It is obvious that the reason assigned for my dismissal was a mere pretext, eagerly caught at for want of any good reason. The real ground was a weak truckling to hostile intrigues of the Orleans family, Austria, Russia, Saxony, and Bavaria, and to some degree also of the present Prussian Government. All of these found

their respective views and systems of policy thwarted by the course pursued by the British Government, and they thought that if they could remove the minister they would change the policy...."(9)

Louis Napoleon's coup d'etat of December 2, 1851, made him virtual dictator of France. This caused grave uneasiness in England, where the alarmists at once set to work fanning the flame. Naval and military officers on half-pay during peace time wrote anonymous letters which appeared in the press. They contained all sorts of weird stories. Some charged that the Continental despots were laying dark plots against England in order to crush out liberty in Europe. Others declared that the French were burning to avenge Waterloo and cited as proof a foolish pamphlet by the Prince de Joinville which attempted to show how easily England might be conquered. Austria, angry with England because of her sympathy for Hungary in her recent revolt, and because of the thrashing given General Haynau, the Austrian Butcher of Brescia fame, by draymen during his recent visit to England, was held to be ready to join the coalition.⁽¹⁰⁾

In February 1852, when Russell brought forth a second militia bill, designed to develop a local militia, Palmerston opposed it, because of its wording. He moved that the word "local" should be struck from the text, in order to create a Militia which could be used in any part of the Kingdom. This amendment, which passed in spite of the opposition of the ministry, occasioned its fall. The short-lived Derby ministry which followed sponsored a bill of Palmerston's liking.

The peace men, as usual, were wide awake to the impending danger and launched a fierce campaign to defeat the proposed legislation. At a conference held under the auspices of the Peace Congress Committee in London, February 6, it was unanimously resolved to oppose the militia bill. The Committee sent out large quantities of circular letters, tracts, petition forms, and posting-bills, and held numerous public meetings throughout England and Scotland. This agitation was partially responsible for the more than 1400 petitions against the bill, which were presented to the House of Commons, and for the minority vote of 165 which favored (11) throwing out the bill on its second reading. The opposition in Parliament was led by Cobden and Gibson. All the aristocratic parties and the court favored an increase in armaments, and the press on the whole supported the bill. (12) Cobden, in a letter dated March 11, wrote, "Never was the military spirit half so rampant in this country since the Peace (1815) as at present." He cited the killing of 300 Burmese at Rangoon, a deed applauded without question by public opinion. On May 5, Cobden wrote Sturge, in part as follows;

"I am not quite sure yet that we may not draw the sting from the Militia Bill, and make it so different a thing in Committee that its author may repudiate it. It is thought that the present Government is vexed at having to carry the measure through, and they will be far more sick of it before we have done with them...."(13)

But despite the determined opposition of the peace party, a large appropriation for military purposes, including the

provision for a militia, was voted to meet the imaginary
(10)
danger.

In a letter of June 9, to Joseph Sturge, Cobden commented on the support which the bill had received.

"....On analysing the division list, I find that in almost every case, where it was possible to bring public opinion to bear upon members, your party succeeded in preventing them from supporting the third reading. The majority was made up of county members (chiefly Protectionists) and the representatives of small pocket boroughs. This shows that if we had a fair representation, you could hold the military party in check. But you can do nothing without a change in the county representation...." (13)

Cobden was not long in coming forth with a suggestion that the gaining of influence over the county votes was a necessity, as his following letter of September 14, to Sturge indicates;

"I hold, that before you can rationally hope to reduce the army or the navy, you must bring the public mind to agree to the abolition of the militia. And I should also, with all due deference say, that until we can recover this lost ground for the Peace party in England, it will be a little inconsistent in us to travel abroad to teach our doctrines to other nations. The establishment of the militia was a disastrous defeat sustained by the Peace party, and until we can regain our position of 1851, it is useless to think of getting back to 1835 (the first increase in military establishments following 1815). How are we to take this step and thus recover our lost position? I repeat by acquiring some influence in the Counties, for it was by the votes of county members in opposition to a majority of the representatives of boroughs that the measure was passed...." (14)

Acting upon Cobden's suggestion, the Herald of Peace published a plan by which the peace party might secure control of the county vote in Parliament.

"The peace party have never hitherto taken a part in county contests. Few of our friends have thought of

qualifying themselves as county voters; and the idea has never entered the head of one of our party that we might be able, by taking the proper measures beforehand, to have as potent a voice in the selection of 'knights of the shire' as of borough members. But this can only be done by arming ourselves with the constitutional weapon of warfare, the franchise. And fortunately the conditions on which a county vote can be had are so easy, that it is within the reach of almost every body above the rank of the agricultural laborer."

The simplest kind of qualification for county voting was that any man in England and Wales over twenty-one years of age, who for six months had owned a freehold (not necessarily land) worth forty shillings a year, was entitled to register for the county in which his property was located. The editorial closed with a stirring appeal to duty;

"....We exhort our friends everywhere in England and Wales to set to work to increase the influence of the peace party by qualifying themselves....The counties stop the way of the peace movement.....let individuals prepare to do their duty; -- and let all who have secured a county vote for themselves, ring in their neighbours' ears -- qualify! qualify! qualify!"(15)

Opposition to the hated Militia act did not stop with the scheme to effect its repeal by gaining control over county representation in Parliament. Determined steps were taken to deter young men from volunteering for militia service. Bills opposing enlistments were circulated widely. Robert Charleton headed the opposition at Bristol where "we are told there has been only one volunteer". In Suffolk a lady, "worth a dozen ordinary men" so filled the county with the anti-militia literature that "scarcely a man has enlisted." Sturge, Bowly, and Stokes, carried on similar operations (16) in the midland counties.

As reported in the "Herald of Peace" this aggressive campaign stands in marked contrast with the original purpose of the Society to carry on its work quietly, by educating the people through the distribution of tracts and the holding of meetings.

In justifying the new course, the "Herald" admits that

"....this is rather a warlike illustration..... for the friends of Peace; but it cannot be helped..... We are engaged in a war of principles which must be long and fierce, for no truth of such compass and significance as that we hold, ever emerged into supremacy except through arduous and protracted conflict...."

Therefore the argument continues;

"....Better not work at all, than to work in such a sort as to belie the sincerity of our professions..... There are objects and occasions in this world about which strong language must and ought to be used, and where the employment of soft or mild language would be treason to truth and the God of truth.....In every age, the men who have successfully assailed great and deeply-rooted systems of evil have found mild and mincing terms inadequate....."

And to effectively remove all scruples, the argument is further reinforced by copious citation of Biblical precepts and examples. (16)

The British Home Office countered by declaring that the placards which the peace men were circulating were libelous. As a result the distributors in various parts of the country were visited by policemen, threatened, and in some instances summoned and subjected to "other such petty annoyances, as men of small minds, dressed in a little brief authority, love to display, in order to impress their neighbors with a suitable sense of their importance." (17) The next move was with the Peace forces. They saw their opportunity. When a man in

Buckinghamshire was committed to trial for March 1853, for this offense, sixty-three peace leaders sent a letter to Secretary Walpole of the Home Office, avowing the authorship of the offensive placards for which others were being prosecuted, and protesting on the ground of "our liberty as Englishmen,
(18)
and our duty as Christians". A month passed without reply.

Meanwhile the Derby ministry had fallen, and the new Aberdeen Government, with Palmerston in the Home Office, had come in. A copy of the letter which had previously been sent Secretary Walpole was now submitted to Palmerston, his successor. Palmerston was asked to state his attitude toward the persecutions.

"Several respectable tradesmen", the letter ran, "are held to bail to take their trial at the approaching assizes on this charge, and one poor man is in prison, where he has lain for nearly two months, for no other offense but circulating these bills recommending young men not to enlist in the Militia".
(19)

An early reply was requested. A week later, a very brief letter from H. Waddington in the Home Office, was received, stating that "while his Lordship abstains from expressing the opinion which he entertains as to the course pursued by the Peace Society", he declined to discuss the matter of the
(18)

prosecutions. Not to be avoided, however, Henry Richard, Secretary of the Peace Society, addressed Palmerston a second time, stating,

"....I beg to say in reply, that your lordship must have misapprehended the purport of my note, as I did not ask your lordship either to favour me with your lordship's opinion on the conduct of the Peace Society or to enter

into a discussion with them on any matter whatsoever, but simply to inform me what are the intentions of the present government in reference to those persecutions." (18)

Two days later this terse reply was received, again from H. Waddington,

"....I am to inform you that Lord Palmerston has no other answer to give to the question you ask than that which you have already received." (18)

The Government, however, abandoned the prosecutions, Palmerston giving as his reason that whatever may have been the intentions of those circulating the literature, they had failed in their objective and had been treated with contempt. The "Herald of Peace" in reply, insisted that the prosecutions themselves were proof of the falsity of Palmerston's statement, and that Palmerston had been forced to quash the proceedings, "because he durst not make an attempt in the name of a liberal government to gag the press, and put down free discussion." Then it proceeded to advise him "to try to learn to govern his tongue", for he was "an old man, and ought to have sufficient control over himself, not to be constantly inspiring dislike and prejudice towards himself and those with whom he is associated in the Ministry, by his boyish impertinence and flippancy of speech". (19)

During the latter part of 1852, two events occurred, which greatly augmented the war spirit, increased the panic, and stiffened the peace men to still more determined effort. The Duke of Wellington, the very personification of the military idealism of Great Britain, and who had for years stood among the foremost advocates of increased defense, died September

14, in the midst of defense agitation. Throughout the Nation, funeral orations extolling his valorous deeds turned the minds of the people toward the "glories of war". For the Peace Society, at such a critical time, therefore, Wellington alive was much less of a danger than Wellington dead.

More serious still was Louis Napoleon's coup d'etat of December 2 of the same year, which established the Second French Empire. The word "la empire" linked with the name "Napoleon" produced in England a psychosis of terror which boded evil for the peace of Europe. Though there was no real dispute between France and England, alarmist newspapers and pamphlets, as usual, published stories of plots and counter-plots. England, to satisfy French revenge, was to be suddenly attacked and pillaged! The French had established a naval base in the West Indies! General Changarnier had divulged a secret plan for taking London! French troops, tired of Rome, were anticipating the sacking of London! Shipbuilders on the Clyde had received orders for steam frigates from the French Government! A French man-of-war had appeared at Dover! The "London Times" led in this sensational news, which was believed by multitudes. The result was an immediate increase in the size of both the army and navy.

The peace party, led by Cobden, attempted to counteract the panic, which to them seemed both unfounded and dangerous. In order to appeal to the reason of calmer men, Cobden produced at this juncture, a pamphlet "1792 and 1853, in Three Letters",

in which he showed that England's entrance into the war against France in 1793 was unjustified, and drew a parallel between the situation of that date and the existing one. In both cases deep-seated hatred dominated. "Gobden, in the pamphlet, strove to show Englishmen how to become more generous, more noble, and more just in their judgments on other nations."⁽²⁰⁾

The pamphlet closed with the statement,

"I have travelled much,.....and I confess I have arrived at the conclusion that there is no country where so much is required to be done before the mass of the people become what is pretended they are, what they ought to be, and what I trust they will yet be, as in England."⁽²⁰⁾

In order to combat more effectively the all but overwhelming war spirit of the country, the friends of peace issued a call for a conference at Manchester for January 27-28, 1853.⁽²¹⁾ No Peace Congress had been held in 1852, as noted above, because of the warlike spirit rife in England. As Gobden had written to Sturge "At this moment we are doing more than any other people to keep up the vast peace armaments of which we complain.....Can you in the face of such facts travel to the Continent to advocate a reduction of establishments?"⁽²²⁾ The Manchester Conference, then, was the first great peace assembly since the London Congress of 1851, but really was not a continuation of the series of international Peace Congresses, inasmuch as it was of a decidedly local nature, and was directed against the specific danger of war with France. The peace men themselves spoke of it as a conference rather than a congress.

The circular of invitation issued by the Provisional Committee formed at Manchester to cooperate with the London Congress Committee, stated,

"Never, certainly, since this body had existence in this country, in an organized form, was there a time when they were so loudly called upon to make a stand for their principles, as at this moment. A resolute attempt is being made to rekindle the war spirit, which has slumbered for years."

It further declared that the Manchester meeting must be a national demonstration or it would fail in its object. (21) The circular which called the convention was signed by about 200 influential men of various parts of the Kingdom, including (23) nineteen members of Parliament. Gladstone and Sir W. Molesworth of the Aberdeen Ministry were decidedly for peace and encouraged the Manchester Conference in every way possible. When Richard and Stokes went there early to make the necessary preliminary arrangements, they found it necessary because of the panicky state of public opinion to exercise the greatest tact. Finally on the appointed day the Conference met in the (24) Free Trade Hall, with George Wilson in the chair. The resolutions adopted by the Conference declared it was the solemn duty of ministers of religion, parents, teachers, and publishers to use their influence to diffuse pacific principles and sentiments. Another favored arbitration of international differences. Political intervention, and the governmental system of India and other British colonies, which tended to foster a military spirit and to involve the country in war, were alike condemned. The Militia Act of 1852 was declared

unnecessary and impolitic, and the Conference recommended strenuous efforts for its immediate repeal. It further recommended that a deputation should present the Earl of Aberdeen, as Prime Minister, with a statement of the attitude of the Conference on the great military establishments of Europe. Prizes of not more than £400 were offered for the best essays upon the evil of the existing European armaments. Another Continental Peace Congress for the ensuing year was recommended. At Manchester, about £14,000 was subscribed in about a half-hour, to be spent in the campaign to be waged against the war spirit. Both Manchester and London were chosen as centers of operation in the anti-war operations. (25)

Among the speakers of the Manchester Conference were Rev. F. Tucker, Rev. Newman Hall, and Rev. George W. Conder, (26) but above all, Cobden, whose speech deserves examination. He showed that the panic was groundless and argued that England's belligerent attitude, instead of damaging Napoleon III would instead unite the French Nation behind him. The panic he attributed to the ignorance of the masses, and advocated sending four or five lecturers throughout the country to present the true situation.

"....Now let us tell those people who have fancied they have had it all their own way, for some time, in calling out for more soldiers, and in threatening us with a French invasion, that we are going to have a good deal to say upon that question, and they may expect to meet us in every borough and town in the Kingdom...."

Cobden felt that the news of their operations would do much to counteract the effect produced by the British press upon public opinion in France.

At this time Elihu Burritt, through his League of Universal Brotherhood, revived a plan, previously used by British peace men during the Oregon controversy with the United States, whereby friendly addresses from leading British cities were sent to corresponding French cities. Burritt was instrumental in the framing of over fifty such manuscript letters and addresses, and personally delivered them. The letters disclaimed sympathy with the unfriendly sentiments toward France then being heralded by the British press, and invited French cooperation in preserving peace. London, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Dublin sent communications to Paris, Manchester to Marseilles, Liverpool to Lyons, Birmingham to Bordeaux, Bristol to Brest, Leeds to Lisle, Sheffield to Strassburg, etc. In France, Burritt made copies of every address for publication in the local journals, and thus the French people were informed that English public opinion was far from
(27)
being unanimously hostile to their Government.

In accordance with a resolution of the Manchester Conference, a deputation of fifty or sixty prominent men, including sixteen members of Parliament, on February 26, waited on the Prime Minister at his Downing Street office to present
(28)
him the address of the Conference. Aberdeen was more than courteous, he was cordial, in his reception of the delegates.

After Cobden, Hume, and Samuel Gurney had spoken in behalf of the views contained in the address, Aberdeen assured the deputation that he had never met a delegation in whose object he more fully concurred. He further stated that the danger of aggression had been greatly exaggerated. He declared,

"There cannot be a doubt that the energetic action of the Peace Conference has been very acceptable to the Government. It has enabled them to resist the pressure of men who have a great interest in the augmentation of our expenditures, and to restore the public mind to a reasonable degree of calmness. There was no small danger of the country being carried away by a war panic when their timely interposition gave a check to the mischief."

Thus the Prime Minister recognized the valuable service rendered the country by the peace party.

Following the Manchester Conference, especially during the months of February, March and April, the peace men held about 160 meetings, addressed by able speakers, in the important cities and towns of the Kingdom. At these meetings, resolutions and petitions to Parliament and the Government were drawn up, urging the recognition of the principles expressed at Manchester. Cobden's pamphlet "1792 and 1853", was used to good advantage in this agitation, 47,900 copies of it alone being circulated by the Peace Society. Besides this number, 38,000 copies were sold by various publishers, and the pamphlet was published in extenso in the "London Times", which then had a circulation of about 40,000. Moreover, about a half million smaller tracts and pamphlets, condemning war on various grounds, were circulated.

In reward for their efforts to preserve peace the pacifists were insulted, grossly misrepresented, and stigmatized as bad citizens, insensible to the danger which threatened the safety and honor of their country. Nor was all the criticism of the peace men groundless, for some certainly were guilty of expressing foolish and impractical sentiments. Elihu Burritt, when asked what should be done in case of a French invasion wrote an article, from which the following excerpt is taken;

"....'If thine enemy hunger feed him; if he thirst, give him drink'. This is a Gospel weapon for the closest action for hand-to-hand contest. In this way to 'heap coals of fire' on the head of a foe, the closest contact is necessary, and with this weapon we would meet the French at every step of their march from Dover to London. At every step they should encounter new evidence that they trod the soil of their best friends. At every step they should face their friendly expression. At every step the coals of Christian kindness should be showered upon their heads. And, having done all this, we would stand with the loins girded about, and feet shod with this preparation of the Gospel, and leave the issue with God...." (30)

It needs to be recalled that Burritt held to the full non-resistance principle, but one can imagine how war-inflamed British public opinion would have received a statement of the above sort, especially from an American visitor.

One of the most vital factors in counteracting the invasion panic against France, was that just at this time war clouds began to rise in Southeastern Europe, giving England somewhat more ground for alarm. The development of this Near East crisis in 1853, very likely prevented a break between England and France. And strange as it may seem, within a year the very group in England who had execrated Napoleon III

as a desperate bandit now extolled him as a loyal ally.

In spite of Napoleon III's statement that the Empire meant peace, the military tradition which had given him his position as Emperor soon began to assert itself in an aggressive foreign policy. The Near Eastern crisis developed from a quarrel between Russia and France over the holy places in Palestine. Russia, ever anxious to extend her extra-territorial interests within the Ottoman Empire demanded of the Sublime Porte the sole right to protect Greek Catholics within Turkish territory. The Sultan, feeling English and French interests would compel them to support him, refused to accede to Russia's ultimatum, and war was forthwith precipitated. The Crimean War not only involved Russia and Turkey, but Great Britain, France, and Sardinia as well.

During the wars of the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic eras the war-thirst of Europe had been thoroughly sated. The public mind, as has been seen, during the period following was very receptive to peace ideas and to talk of retrenchment. The franchise reform Bill of 1832 in England, by adding to the electorate a large section of the middle classes strengthened appreciably the peaceful attitude of the Government. The Peace Societies of the period rapidly gained ground, and there appeared to be developing a sincere conviction on the part of the British people that only defensive war was justifiable. Within the country, however, there was a small military clique, whose activity has been

noted. With the growth of exuberant nationalism this small faction, potent because of the support which it received from some of the highest and most influential classes and from the leading journals, became jingoistic. The crisis in the Near East afforded them an excellent opportunity of alarming the English people against Russia's inordinate desire for control of the Straits, which in English opinion, would threaten British supremacy in India. A fact which increased Britain's uneasiness was that she shared with the rest of Europe an exaggerated notion of the military potentiality of Russia. Moreover Russian autocracy was obnoxious to liberal-minded Englishmen, who had been greatly incensed over Russian intervention in Hungary in 1849, and had wasted a great deal of not very intelligent sympathy for the Poles. England, forgetting her own misdeeds in China and India, was shocked by Russian aggression against Turkey. An economic factor which also played a part was that England was unusually prosperous at this time, due largely to Free Trade adopted in 1846, and "Jeshurun waxed fat and kicked".⁽³¹⁾

Recalling the success of the Manchester Conference of January in opposing the French panic, the friends of peace decided to call a similar one at Edinburgh on October 12 and 13, to consider the threatened war with Russia and decide upon plans best suited to prevent it. The chief reason for selecting Scotland as the meeting place was that that country as a whole was more militaristic even than England, due

largely to the system of military rule in India which "has been widely profitable to the middle and upper classes in Scotland, who have had more than their numerical proportion of its patronage."⁽³²⁾

The original plan was to hold the Conference in Queen Street Hall, but because of the large demand for visitor's tickets a larger hall was necessary, so Music Hall was finally engaged.⁽²⁹⁾ Duncan MacLaren, Lord Provost of Edinburgh, who presided, opened the conference with a denunciation of war, announcing as the purpose of the Congress the dissemination of peace principles. Henry Richard announced that the Continental Peace Congress proposed by the Manchester Conference had been postponed because of the inflamed condition of public opinion in England. He felt it would be impolitic to attempt to hold such a Congress in France or Germany, either of which were as peaceful as England itself. Their business was at home.⁽²⁹⁾ The outstanding speech of the conference was delivered by John Bright, who spoke of the blessings of peace in the long period following Vienna. He then turned to a discussion of the military expenditures which were threatening to bankrupt Europe. Among other significant statements was this;

"....The British Lion is an old animal now; I wish it would die once and for all.....I am almost ashamed to belong to a country which conducts itself as if it were a tribe of Red Indians. We never bury the hatchet -- we never give up war, or at least talking about it...."

He closed by urging the Government to treat all foreign nations courteously, justly and honorably, and to follow a policy of non-intervention. He urged an agreement with France on the reduction of the size of the army and navy, which would entail a sorely felt reduction in taxes. (29)

Henry Vincent felt the time was at hand when the commercial spirit of the country would say, "Away with secret diplomacy, and whatever is done affecting the lives and liberties of the world, let it be done openly and above board". Other notable speeches were made by Samuel Bowley, Edward Miall, John Burnett, Thomas Biggs, and Rev. G. W. Conder of Leeds. The resolutions adopted at Edinburgh dealt with the duty of ministers, parents, teachers and publishers to exert their influence to combat war; the use of arbitration; the reduction of armaments; non-intervention; and the military governmental system of India and the colonies. Another interesting resolution urged the promotion of "cheap international postage, the general adoption of the same standard of weights, measures, and coinage, the removal of commercial restrictions, and the assimilation of the mercantile and commercial laws and usages of all civilized nations." After the Conference, a public meeting, at which Cobden, Bright, and Admiral Charles Napier were the chief speakers, also adopted these resolutions. (29) For some time after the Edinburgh demonstration, the operations of the Peace Society were centered especially upon Scotland, where 20,000 copies of

the proceedings of the Conference were circulated by leading pacifists in public meetings held in the principal cities of the country. (33)

Joseph Sturge in December of 1853, conceived the project of leading a deputation from the English Society of Friends to the Tsar of Russia, in an attempt to prevent the threatening war by working upon the single mind which controlled the destinies of Russia. (34) He felt that an earnest appeal from the heart, based on religious and humanitarian motives, by Christian men of no political connections might accomplish more than haughty diplomacy supported by threats of force. Such things had been accomplished, even with tsars of Russia. The interest of Alexander I in the English Quakers and their influence upon him are notorious. Sturge's project was adopted by the Committee for Sufferings of the Friends Society of England, and Sturge, accompanied by Henry Pease and Robert Charleton, -- all active workers in the London Peace Society -- set out for Russia in January 1854. Since the mission was sponsored by the Society of Friends and only indirectly related to the Peace Society, a brief mention only of their interesting experiences is appropriate here. At St. Petersburg they were kindly received by Nesselrode, the Tsar, and several members of his family. In the interview with Nicholas I, he declared that he had high respect for England and Victoria, and expressed surprise that England should suspect his motives in the East. His written statement concerning the possibility of war with England,

contained the following statement;

"I am anxious to avoid war by all possible means. I will not attack, and shall only act in self-defence; but I cannot be indifferent to what concerns the honor of my country. I have a duty to perform as a Sovereign. As a Christian I am ready to comply with the precepts of religion. On the present occasion, my great duty is to attend to the interests and honor of my country."

On the whole it was rather an unsatisfactory statement. Before the mission left Russia the mail from England arrived with accounts of the attacks made upon the Tsar in the British Parliament, and the delegation perceived a distinct coolness in the treatment accorded them by the Russian royal family, although they were courteous to the end and assisted them in making arrangements for a speedy return home. Joseph Sturge, sincere Quaker that he was, had acted through a sense of religious duty and responsibility. The British press, however, painted him as one with an inordinate desire for publicity and a passion for contact with royalty. The press further ridiculed the undertaking as presumptuous interference from the Peace Society. But though the mission met with hearty approval from the Peace Society, officially it had no connection with it.

(34)

Meanwhile public opinion in England, incited by its militant press, became more and more ungovernable. Public meetings were becoming dangerous. They seemed to excite rather than to calm the public mind. To meet the situation, the Peace Society called a conference of the peace leaders at which it was decided instead of holding public meetings

to circulate their publications quietly. This work was taken up on an unprecedented scale. During the year ending with May 1854, 900,000 publications were circulated by the Society. (35)

During the invasion panic of 1853-53, Aberdeen, Prime Minister, and Gladstone, Chancellor of the Exchequer, both men worthy of the highest confidence, had shown themselves in favor of peace. But despite the fact that the Prime Minister favored peace, the country drifted slowly and surely toward war. So strong was the faith of the country in these men that it was felt impossible that they could be moving for months in the wrong course without knowing it. And because they remained in office when war did finally come, most people regarded it as an indication that the war was just and necessary. (36)

Gobden and Bright, leaders of first-rate ability and fearlessness, with unsullied names and good arguments, were helpless. Their influence was impaired by the stand they had previously taken on the general question of war. They were popularly held to endorse fully the peace-at-any-price principle. "A man can not have weight against all war." (36) Bright's interest in the economic welfare of the traders and workmen of the country was felt to be so strong by the chauvinists that he would willingly forego national honor and dignity for material gain. (36)

The press had worked public opinion into a state of unreasoning prejudice. No longer was there a chance for peace

men to prevent war. Late in October 1855, in a letter to his friend M. Chevalier, a prominent French economist, Cobden wrote, as follows;

"....Depend on it there is a good deal of unreasoning passion and pecuniary selfishness on the part of the people and the press of this country in the present war-like clamour. I know proprietors of newspapers..... who have pocketed £3,000 or £4,000 a year through the war, as directly as if the money had been voted to them in the Parliament estimates...."(37)

The average daily increase in circulation of some of the leading British dailies during the year 1854, as compared with 1853, was as follows: "London Times", 6,600; "Daily News", 1,022; "Morning Chronicle", 795; "Express", 686; "Sun", 592; "Daily News", 488; "Daily Express" (Dublin), 440; "Morning Advertiser", 321. The weekly publications showed still greater weekly gains: "News of the World", 42,475; "Illustrated London News", 29,062; "Reynold's Weekly", 19,125; "Lloyd's Weekly" (London), 17,786; "Weekly Times", 11,176.⁽³⁸⁾

The decision of the Peace Society to work quietly by circulating anti-war tracts at the opening of the war, has been stated. Very few peace demonstrations were held during 1854, but in the following year meetings were held in great number. A Stop-the-War League was formed which was especially active in this respect. All told about 150 peace meetings were held during the year ending June 1856.⁽³⁹⁾ Considerable opposition was encountered at some of these meetings. At Cardiff, Wales, for example, there was almost a panic in anticipation of a meeting which Richard was to hold. He, a native Welshman, was denounced as an emissary of the Tsar.

Local officials were forced to take special precautionary measures to preserve order. After Richard had faced a turbulent assembly for about two hours, with frequent interruptions, the mayor, in order to prevent violence, dissolved the meeting. (40) Joseph Sturge was refused a hearing and insulted in Birmingham, his own home, and John Bright was burnt in effigy by a mob at Manchester, his own constituency. (41) At the instance of 600 electors of Manchester, a meeting was convoked in December of 1854, "in order to enable the citizens to declare that they do not concur in the opinion of Mr. Bright, but are fully convinced of the justice and the necessity of the war". Bright's friends, however, proposed the amendment that "it would be unfair, tyrannical, and unjust to censure Mr. Bright, even by implication for the honest and manly avowal of his sentiments, upon a subject so important to the welfare of all classes in the kingdom. The meeting was very boisterous and after four or five unsuccessful attempts to determine which side was in ascendance, (42) the mayor dissolved the meeting.

During the war, the regular press gave the pacifists no hearing, but instead misrepresented their views, ridiculed their measures, and maligned their motives. Consequently they felt a special need for a daily newspaper, free from any connection with the Peace Society, in which to advance all liberal principles, including peace. In this regard, Cobden, in September 1855, wrote Bright, as follows:

"....I should be inclined to say that it would be as well not to have a too enthusiastic peace man as its managing editor. The difficulty is to get a daily newspaper with a circulation of 30,000 established. If it be an expansion of the "Herald of Peace", it will never be established as a newspaper -- at least not this year. There must be a good deal of wisdom of the serpent as well as the harmlessness of the dove to float such a paper, and unless it can be established as a newspaper, it will not attain the object we have in view...." (43)

In considering means of effecting his project, Joseph Sturge was appealed to. He hesitated for some time because he feared that such a publication might drift from its original
(44)
purpose. At length he decided favorably to the plan, and characteristically threw himself heartily into the work of raising the necessary capital. The result was the establishment in 1855, of the "Morning and Evening Star", which for a number of years was edited jointly by a man named Hamilton and Henry Richard. It was the original intention that Richard should be a general supervisor of the paper. In this capacity he was not very successful in making an appeal to the public. After a painful and embarrassing situation had
(45)
arisen, he was replaced by S. Lucas.

The paper was not entirely successful, as the following letter to Lucas from Cobden suggests:

"October 17, 1861 -- "I said in one of my notes to you that the Star should not appear the organ of a sect. I will give you an illustration a propos of this remark. In an otherwise excellent and tolerant article on Lord John yesterday, you bring in Bright and myself at the close to sting him by our contrast. This is the kind of remark which stamps your paper as the organ of a strait sect which tolerates nothing but what comes from your own preachers. You remember the anecdote I gave you of a person I travelled with in the railway carriage from Guilford to London, when he bought the Telegraph

and I the Star. He remarked, 'I don't like the Star, it is so intolerant; it never admits anybody to be right but Bright and Cobden.' I should like to make a bargain with you in the interest of your paper, not to let my name appear in your leaders (unless to find fault with me) for two years." (46)

Especially embittered was the Peace Society by the support and encouragement given the war by various religious men. For example, on April 26, 1854, which date was set aside as a National Fast Day, Dr. Robert Lee, Minister of Old Greyfriars, and Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of Edinburgh, preached a sermon "On War", in which he vindicated the Christian lawfulness of the custom, and attempted to (47) refute the doctrines of the Peace Society. Such Christians were denounced by an editorial in the "Herald of Peace" which declared:

"The most anxious and elaborate apologies for war that have appeared within the last twelve months, have come from professedly religious sources." (48)

In concluding the discussion of the rise and triumph of the war spirit in England, the question which now needs to be considered is, what was its effect upon the peace movement. That it gave it a severe reverse is evident. To calculate the extent is more difficult. Inasmuch as the Peace Society did not publish periodically a statement of its membership, it is impossible to determine any numerical decrease in membership which must have resulted. However, an examination of the annual financial statements published in the "Herald of Peace" reveals a notable decrease in the income and expenditures of the Society during the years of

the war. In the year 1851, the total income of the society amounted to 2,554/10/1½. From then until 1854, during the period of the war panics, there was a gradual decrease. The report for 1854, the first year of the war, was not published. It is singular that in the twenty-five year period examined, this was the only missing report. In 1855, the annual income had fallen to 1,491/8/9, which represents a financial decrease of something like 40%, compared with the year 1851. A slight increase appeared for the year 1856, but another decrease the following year. Not until 1860, was the figure of 1851 surpassed. But whatever may have been the extent of the loss of membership, which probably was not as great as the financial statements might indicate, inasmuch as a great majority of the members were Quakers and members of other religious sects, whose sentiment toward war would not be greatly altered, the loss of popular esteem resulting from opposition to the war and the general affect of the war influence upon the public mind were more telling. The Peace Society to a great extent had lost what hold it had once had upon public opinion.

However, one vainly examines the files of the "Herald of Peace", until the year 1858, for an admission of this fact, but thereafter such articles are abundant. An editorial in the January 1858 "Herald of Peace" runs:

"....The difficulties that beset the bold and consistent advocacy of Peace principles are hardly less formidable now than they were then. And yet we venture to greet our readers, if not with very buoyant and ex-

ulting hopes, at least without despondence...."(49)

In the following October, there appeared this statement;

"....Open, manly opposition, is not the point of danger with us. It would cost little to be a peace reformer if on had only wholesome argument and candid difficulties to deal with; but the tittering gibe, the whispered innuendo, the cutting sarcasm, the contemptuous sneer, -- these are the most successful weapons with which to thin the Peace ranks, as indeed they have always been Satan's most successful weapons with which to unman or to unnerve the ranks of his opponents...."(50)

In the late '50's there developed another French invasion panic in England. At that time Palmerston saw in a quarrel between Spain and Morocco over territory along the coast of Northwest Africa the hand of French diplomacy attempt to grasp a point near Gibraltar in order to endanger English interests in the Mediterranean. Acting under these suspicions he at once began to advocate increased fortifications by his usual method of alarmist letters. Such agitation had its effect, and in 1858, a secret commission was appointed to study the relative military positions of England and France. This committee presented to Parliament in January 1859, a study over the preceding six-year period, which caused many to take fright and join in the cry for
(51)
increased armaments. Bright suggested in a speech before the House of Commons that instead of considering warlike appropriations, a treaty establishing free trading relations should be made with France. Acting upon this suggestion, Michel Chevalier, a noted French economist and disciple of St. Simon, came to England and urged Cobden, who was

preparing to visit France, to press the matter of a commercial treaty with Napoleon III. Gladstone, Chancellor of the Exchequer, when approached on the subject, favored it. Cobden went to Paris to negotiate. The treaty which he secured with the French in 1860, greatly increased commercial intercourse between France and England, and brought a great improvement in the political relations between the two countries.

The English war-spirit in the decade following 1856, was in great measure sustained by intermittent colonial and imperialistic conflicts in China, Persia, India, Japan, Syria, Afghanistan, Canada, Ceylon, South Africa, New Zealand, etc. The fact that Lord Palmerston was Prime Minister during the decade of 1855-65, with the exception of the brief four-months' ministry of the Earl of Derby in 1858, has its special significance in this connection. During the same period the next few years following, a series of nationalistic wars were being waged on the Continent and in America. They include the Austro-Sardinian War of 1859, the American Civil War, 1861-65, the Polish Revolt of 1863, the Danish War of 1864, the Austro-Prussian War of 1866, and the Franco-German War of 1870-71. All of these wars had their disturbing problems for the British, even though they were not engaged in them.

The Civil War in America had the same general effect upon the American Peace Society, as the Crimean War had had upon the London Society. In addition, the American society

was discredited by the stand which it took in regard to the war. First off, it ignored the danger of conflict until (52) the war had actually broken out. In the early days of the struggle, the "Advocate of Peace", in line with much other opinion of the day, was for letting the Southern States (53) secede in peace. Then with war actually facing them, the Peace Society officially held that it was not war, but simply "a process of law against its violators", and upheld the (54) government in "enforcing law". Their Society was directed (54) only against international war, they declared. "It is no part of our mission as a Peace Society, to say what shall be done with thieves and robbers, with pirates, mobs or rebels. Such questions belong to government, and there we (55) must leave them." Their attitude was that they had nothing to do with bringing on the disturbance and had people paid more attention to the teachings of the Peace Society, the conflict could not have occurred. "Now, is Peace to be held responsible for what War alone has done? Let the dead bury their own dead. Let the war system meet the recoil of (55) its own principles....." Such evasion of apparent duty could not but react disastrously upon the Society. Even the London Peace Society sharply criticized the stand of its sister Society, and there followed tiffs back and forth. It must in fairness be recognized that the situation created by the War for the peace society was impossible. It was much worse than the peace party in England had to face during

the Crimean War. But even this cannot exculpate them.

The general indifference of the public to the principles of the Peace Societies during the period following the outbreak of the Crimean War was discouraging to the pacifists indeed. The following significant statement taken from a New Year's (1860) editorial in the "Herald of Peace", recognizes the changed condition;

"The year 1860 opens upon the world under auspices that seem unfavourable to the cause of peace. Indeed, ever since the breaking out of the Russian war fever in 1853, a change has come over the spirit of the nations, especially of our own, which is not a change for the better....."(56)

The Annual Report of the London Peace Society for 1860, declared;

"....That the passing appearances of the times are unfavourable, cannot be denied. A vague and ominous misgiving, begotten by past wars and by present preparations for war, is diffused throughout Europe. Public feeling in our own country has become morbid in its excess of suspicion and alarm, and the fashion of the moment has served to throw a meretricious glare around military ideas and pursuits, by which the minds of multitudes have been dazzled...."(57)

Finally, in the Annual Report of 1863, one notes an almost whining tone, deploring the situation into which the peace movement had fallen;

"....It is, indeed, deplorably true, that of late years the world has turned a deaf ear to counsels of peace, and flung itself headlong into the embrace of war. But it may be doubted, whether, in the eye of reason, the results have been such as to justify the tone of ironical triumph against the members of the Peace Society, in which some persons think it decent to indulge, as though they had any interest in trying to avert war beyond what all mankind have in an equal degree, and as though the failure of their efforts to preserve the blessing of peace to the nations were actually a matter of congratulation and rejoicing...."(58)

Thus, it has been shown that in the period following the outbreak of the Crimean War, the war-spirit triumphed in both Europe and America, wrecking the influence of the Peace Societies, which, during an unusually long period of peace had had opportunity to organize, expand and acquire influence. War usually, though not always, checks moral and humanitarian reforms. Public psychology is such that when war occurs all energies are focused on the single aim of securing victory, and reform movements are shoved into the background, where through inaction and loss of interest they stagnate. Occasionally, however, humanitarian gains have been inspired by war. An example of this is the Red Cross Society, originally formed to ameliorate the conditions of war itself. In the occurrence of war in the '50's and '60's, many people who had accepted the extreme views of the Peace Societies that war was unnecessary, and was contrary to Christian precepts, and to the interests of man, saw that war could be fought on grounds other than ambition, and that it could accomplish good, apparently impossible by other means. For example, the American Civil War brought the abolition of slavery. Wars in Europe brought the unification of Germany and Italy. These events showed that the views of the Pioneer Peace Societies were extreme and subject to revision. The second half of the Nineteenth Century saw great stress laid on Nationalism, which developed into Hyper-Nationalism and ushered in Imperialism. The

masses of the people in most countries devoutly supported their governments in their policies, and since these policies often ran counter to the views of the original Peace Societies, these old views were abandoned by most people. Another great cause of the defeat of the Peace Societies was their inherent defects. A great majority of their members remained deductive or idealistic pacifists, opposing war on religious, moral, and humanitarian grounds. They stressed sentiment rather than inductive reasoning. The fact that the Peace Societies which had made great demonstrations in peace time were faced with wars, but failed to prevent them, confirmed the convictions of many that war was inevitable in human society, and hence opposition was impractical and futile. Others who had once favored the Peace Societies now accepted this view. The fact that the Peace Societies had in some cases opposed war when patriotism was a cult, gave color to the charge that pacifists were disloyal. In America the failure of the Peace Society to meet the issue undermined its prestige. In closing, it must be stressed, that most of the ideas advocated by the Peace Societies were in advance of their times. Therein lies their greatest significance.

To the friends of peace the triumph of the war-spirit was indeed disheartening. The bright hopes of the Peace Congresses now seemed but a mockery. But the cause of peace was not dead; nor even conquered. The sunless era

of depression, had pacifists but known it, contained the cause for hope. The labor of the Pioneer Peace Societies was not in vain. Their fertile seed, well sowed, must have its time of germination and of growth if they would reap the harvest.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

For very many people the peace movement began with the First Hague Conference of 1899. However, great events of such a nature do not "just happen", but have roots deeply buried in the past. It has been the purpose of this study to show what are the roots from which the great peace developments of today have sprung.

The Pioneer Organized Movement for World Peace may be divided into two general periods: The ~~P~~Period of Organization and Expansion of societies (1815-43), and the Period of the Peace Congress Movement and its activities (1843-56/61).

The world's first organized peace societies developed out of the period of war-horrors which ushered in the Nineteenth Century. The first three arose independently of each other in America during the very year of Waterloo. There were about fifty societies in America by 1828, when William Ladd succeeded in consolidating the movement as the American Peace Society. The first European society was founded at London in 1816, by philanthropists of the type of William Allen, Thomas Clarkson, and Joseph T. Price. The formation of numerous auxiliary societies followed throughout the United Kingdom. There was organized at Paris in 1819/21, a Society of Christian Morals, one of the purposes of which was to pro-

mote peace. In 1830, another continental society was formed at Geneva, Switzerland. In general, peace sentiment on the continent was not strong and was rather practical than religious, whereas in America and Great Britain, the societies had originated among groups opposed to war on religious and humanitarian grounds, primarily, and with the purpose of eradicating war by educating the people to oppose it. The highly idealistic character of this phase of the movement was, thus, a true expression of the general spirit of an era of Liberalism and Romanticism.

The second period was distinguished by international cooperation, as expressed by the Peace Congresses held at London (1843), Brussels (1848), Paris (1849), Frankfort (1850), and again at London (1851). These congresses gave the stimulus which comes from successful large-scale demonstrations, and for the first time, the cause of peace was effectively called to the attention of the civilized world. Its influence was greatly enhanced. Although generally deemed Utopian, the Congresses worked out a liberal and constructive program. The development of this program by resolutions covering such items as Ladd's project for a Congress and Court of Nations, the codification of international law, arbitration, disarmament, anti-war loans, non-intervention, anti-imperialism, anti-duelling, and internationalism, is shown by the accompanying table. From it will be seen that as the series of Congresses progressed the tendency toward practicality became increasingly noticeable. This trend in the peace movement parallels and reflects the shift

in the general age spirit from Romanticism or Idealism to Realism. This was largely due to practical and liberal statesmen, such as Richard Cobden and John Bright, who stressed, in their opposition to war, the economic arguments primarily, but were willing to cooperate with Peace Society idealists like Joseph Sturge, Henry Richard, and Elihu Burritt. Because of their superior ability and influence these practical men were able to modify appreciably the character of the movement, even though a great majority of its supporters remained idealistic to the end.

The accomplishments of the Pioneer Phase of the Organized Peace Movement were five-fold. First, actual organization for the sole purpose of securing permanent and universal peace was attained. Second, peace ideas were developed and new peace projects conceived. One such was William Jay's suggestion for stipulated arbitration. More notable, however, was William Ladd's plan for a new world order, concerning which James Brown Scott, an outstanding American International Lawyer, has stated:

....."Every international conference meeting between wars for the preservation of peace, which so happily exists, such as the First and Second Hague Conferences, is a tribute to the foresight of William Ladd, who through many years, in an unbelieving world, specifically advocated such conferences and supplied them in advance with their programs. And the existence of the Permanent Court of International Justice at the Hague is but the realization of William Ladd's proposal....." (1)

Third, should be listed the achievements of a practical nature. Such accomplishments belong to the period of Peace Con-

gress influence, at which time determined efforts were made to secure governmental adoption of various parts of their program, especially the principle of arbitration. While attempts to secure its broad adoption by Congressional or Parliamentary resolutions were doomed to disappointment, nevertheless, the principle of arbitration was recognized for specific cases. Such were the Oregon Treaty of 1846, the Claims Convention of 1853, the Fisheries Treaty of 1854, -- all between Great Britain and the United States. There was also the general arbitration clause in the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo between the United States and Mexico, 1848. While these can scarcely be called direct gains for the Peace Movement, they undoubtedly had an indirect influence in each case. More significant still was the securing of the first sanction of the principle of mediation by a Congress of the Powers, at Paris in 1856. Here the influence of the Peace Society is direct and positive as has been pointed out in this study. The significance of this cannot be overstressed since it is recognized as establishing a precedent from which was to spring in time the Hague Court of Arbitration.

Fourth may be counted the broad educational work in the spreading and popularizing of peace ideals, or, in other words, the organization of public opinion in favor of pacific ideals. This service made the proposals of the friends of peace seem less Utopian. For example, people became accustomed to hearing the word "arbitration" and ceased to jeer when it was mentioned, or supported it outright. It was

this necessary preparation which has made subsequent pacific achievements come easier and more quickly.

Last among the accomplishments of the Pioneer Peace Movement was the kindred work of inspiring and training leaders for later developments of the peace movement. Sir Randal Cremer, founder of the International Arbitration League and the Workmen's Peace Society, and a prime mover of the Interparliamentary Union, was inspired by a lecture on "Peace", delivered by a leader of this period, concerning which he said, "That lecture sowed the seed of International Arbitration in my mind, though the word 'arbitration' had hardly been heard"⁽²⁾. Henry Richard, as Secretary of the London Peace Society worked actively for peace in the new period until 1885. Elihu Burritt and Dr. James B. Miles, secretary of the American Peace Society, originated the movement which developed into the International Law Association, a very vital influence for peace.⁽³⁾ Edmond Potonier-Pierre, whose father had been prominent at the Paris Congress in 1849, and who as a boy had attended that meeting and had heard his father discuss peace with his neighbor, Victor Hugo, received his inspiration also from the original Peace Societies. It was he, who, after the war-spirit had triumphed, contributed to the revival of the movement in France.⁽⁴⁾ Some others of the Pioneer Movement, who played an active part in subsequent peace development, were; Richard Cobden. Victor Hugo, Joseph Garnier, John Bright, Michel

Chevalier, Charles Sumner, Dr. G. Warrentrap, Auguste Visschers, Auguste Couvreur, and Julius Rupp. No attempt has been made to exhaust the study of the connecting links between the Pioneer Movement and that which follows, but such a work would no doubt reveal significant facts and serve to strengthen the close bond which is here shown to exist between the original and the revived peace movements.

Such revived peace movements were the aftermath of a reaction which came about the middle of the century. This reaction, marked by rampant nationalism and the resurgence of the war-spirit, blighted the rapidly growing influence of the Peace Movement. In England a series of invasion panics challenged the Peace Society, which, in 1852, suffered its first great rebuff in the passage of the Militia Act of that year. Jingoism, fanned by a military clique and an alarmist press finally, in spite of the strenuous efforts of the peace party, led the country into the Crimean War. This effectively destroyed whatever hold the Peace Society had had upon public opinion in Great Britain. Following this conflict, the war-spirit was kept up by numerous colonial and imperialistic wars, and a series of nationalistic conflicts in Europe and America. The Civil War in America affected the Peace Society there in much the same way that the London Society was affected by the war with Russia. But the movement was not dead. This period of depression, due to apparent defeat, was simply the preparation for a new period of

greater activity with new methods and stresses. The Pioneer Period had been primarily idealistic, religious, and emotional, that is, what has been called "deductive" pacifism. The spirit of the new period was to be distinctly scientific, practical, and realistic. In the first movement there had been one or two leading Peace Societies. In the revived movement there were many societies of highly differentiated character.⁽⁵⁾
⁽⁶⁾

The Era of Revival in the Peace Societies began about the year 1867, for in that year alone six of eight peace societies sprang up in France. The chief one, which served as a model for numerous other societies throughout Europe, was the Ligue Internationale de la Paix, founded in Paris by Frederic Passy. Its name was subsequently changed to the French Society of the Friends of Peace, and later merging with another society, took the name of the International Permanent League of Peace.⁽⁷⁾ The same year there was formed at Geneva the International League of Peace and Liberty, with Charles Lemonnier, Victor Hugo, and Garibaldi present. It advanced political opinions and qualifiedly endorsed war. The period from 1872-5, witnessed very significant developments; the first meeting of the International Law Association at Brussels, and arbitration resolutions in the legislatures of Great Britain, United States, Italy, Sweden, Denmark, and Belgium. Of still greater significance was the date 1889, in which was held the first Pan-American Congress

the Interparliamentary Union was established, and the Second Peace Congress Movement began with a meeting at Paris. Scattered international peace congresses had been held in Geneva in 1867, Paris, 1878, and Brussels, 1882. In the third World Peace Congress of the regular series, held at Berne in 1892, the permanent International Peace Bureau was formed, to centralize the scattered forces of the peace movement. Down to 1911, eighteen World Peace Congresses of the second series had met. The Peace Movement was greatly accelerated by the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907, the first of which created the Permanent Court of Arbitration, while the second established the International Prize Court.

Yet the bright hopes for enduring peace which these significant advancements created were soon to be shown to be groundless. War came again to mock men's work for peace. But, as seen in the case of the wars which gave birth to the Pioneer Organized Peace Societies, so now, a century later, war carried its own nemesis. Strong anti-war revulsion culminated in the creation of the long-needed League of Nations and the World Court of International Justice with their significant achievements for world stabilization.

The End

The following table indicates the content of the various important resolutions adopted by the Peace Societies in their great meetings, in addition to the general resolution common to all, which condemned war and advocated that it was the duty of peace men to educate others concerning its wrongness.	London Convention 1843	Brussels Congress 1848	Paris Congress 1849	Frankfort Congress 1850	London Congress 1851	Manchester Conference January 1853	Edinburgh Conference October 1853
Congress of Nations (William Ladd's Plan; Call Congress to establish Court, Codify International Law, etc.) (a)	+	+	+				
Codification of International Law				+	+		
Arbitration	+	+	+	+(b)	+(b)	+	+
Disarmament		+	+	+	+	+	+
War Loans			+	+	+		
Non-Intervention				+	+	+	+
Imperialism	+(c)				+	+(d)	+(d)
Duelling				+			
British Militia Act, 1852						+	
Encouragement of Free Trade, Cheap Postage, Standard Weights, Measures, Coinage, etc.	+		+				+
Election of Representatives favorable to ideas Peace Society					+		

(a) It is somewhat difficult to explain why the Peace Congress abandoned their agitation for a Congress of Nations, but it must be remembered that at that time the project was held to be extremely Utopian. Cobden, one of their most influential leaders, opposed it, and, moreover, there was during this period a noticeable shifting to stress on more practical ideas. However, in the discussions of the Codification of International Law at succeeding Congresses, a Congress of Nations was frequently mentioned; (b) Merely a general statement. The other Congresses specifically advocated the William Jay plan of stipulated arbitration; (c) The "Opium War" with China; (d) The military governmental system of India and other British Colonies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. GENERAL HELPSA. BIBLIOGRAPHIES and COMPENDIUMS:

Biographie Universelle. au Bureau de la Biographie Universelle. Paris, 1849.

Catalogue de la Bibliotheque de L'Institut Nobel Norvegien. Kristiana, 1912.

Diccionario Encyclopedico Hispano-Americano. Montauer y Simon, editores. Barcelona, 1892.

Dictionary of National Biography. 69 vols. New York, 1885-1912.

Encyclopaedia Americana. New York, 1926.

Encyclopaedia Britannica. Eleventh Edition. Cambridge, 1910.

La Grande Encyclopédie. Société anonyme de la Grande Encyclopédie. 31 vols. Paris, n.d.

Larousse, Pierre. Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIX^e Siecle. Administration Universel. 17 vols. Paris, 1866-76.

Krehbiel, Edward, Nationalism, War, and Society. New York, 1916.

New International Encyclopaedia, Second Edition. New York, 1915.

Ploetz' Manual of Universal History - Houghton, Boston, 1925, Harry Elmer Barnes, Editor.

II. ORIGINAL SOURCESA. OFFICIAL PUBLIC:

Congressional Documents. 29th Congress. 1st Session.

Congressional Globe. 23, p 437; 26, p. 761.
30th Congress, 2nd Session, p. 267.

Congressional Documents. 30th Congress. 2nd Session.

House Executive Documents. 29th Congress. 1st Session
Washington, 1845.

House Reports. 29th Congress. 1st Session.

Journal of House of Representatives. February 5, 1849.

Mallory, William M. Treaties, Conventions, International Acts, Protocols and Agreements, between the United States and Other Powers. 1776-1909. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1910.

Scott, James Brown. Proceedings of the Hague Peace Conferences. Translation of Official Texts. Conference of 1899. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Prepared under Supervision of Scott. New York, 1920.

Senate Executive Documents. 30th Congress. 1st Session
Washington, 1847. 30th Cong. 1st Sess. no. 52-60.

Senate Documents. 56th Congress. 2nd Session. vol. 24, no. 231.
Senate Reports, 270, 31st Congress, 2nd Session.

B. UNOFFICIAL PUBLIC.

I. Narratives:

Balch, Thomas Willing, Emeric Cruce. Philadelphia, 1900.

Bright, John and Rogers, James E. Thorold, Speeches by Richard Cobden, M. P. London, 1903

Channing, William Ellery, Discourses on War. Introduction by Edwin D. Mead. Boston, n.d.

Darby, W. Evans, International Tribunals, Third Edition. London, 1899.

Dodge, David Low, War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ. Introduction by Edwin D. Mead. Boston, 1905.

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates. vols. civ, cvi, cix.
1849 and 1850. London 1849-1850.

Ladd, William, Essay on a Congress of Nations. Introduction by James Brown Scott. New York, 1916.

London Peace Society, The Proceedings of the First General Peace Convention, London 1843. London, 1843.

London Peace Society, Reports of the Peace Congresses at Brussels, Paris, Frankfort, London, Manchester, and Edinburgh, in the years 1848, 1849, 1850, 1851, and 1853. London, 1861.

Mead, Edwin D. The Grand Design of Henry IV. Mead Editor. Boston, 1909.

Old South Leaflets, Directors of the Old South Work, Old South Meeting House. vols. II and VI. Boston.

Sumner, Charles, Addresses on War. Introduction by Edwin D. Mead. Boston, 1902.

Worcester, Noah, A Solemn Review of the Custom of War. Boston, American Peace Society, 1904.

II. Periodicals:

American Peace Society, The Advocate of Peace, 1858-1865. Annual Register, The 1850 London, 1851.

Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine. Edinburgh, November 1849 and March 1853.

Le Moniteur Universel, Journal Officiel de la Republique Francaise. September 23,24,25, 1848; January 9, 1849; August 23,24,25,26, 1849; August 26,30, 1850; July 25, 1851.

London Peace Society, The Herald of Peace. 1819-1863.

Quarterly Review. London. October 1849.

C. PRIVATE: MEMOIRS AND CORRESPONDENCE.

Ballou, Adin, Autobiography. Completed and Edited by his Son-in-Law, William S. Heywood. Lowell, Massachusetts, 1896.

Beust, Count, Memoirs. With Introduction by Baron Henry de Worms. 2 vols. London, 1887.

Call, Mrs. Mable, Mss. Letter. April 29, 1927

Gooch, G. P., Later Correspondence of Lord John Russell, Gooch Editor. 2 vols. London, 1925.

Hemmenway, John, William Ladd, the Apostle of Peace. St. Anthony's Park, Minnesota. 1891.

Maxwell, Sir Herbert, Life and Letters of the Fourth Earl of Clarendon. Maxwell Editor. 2 vols. London, 1913.

Murray, John, Letters of Queen Victoria, 1837-61. 3 vols. London, 1907.

Sherman, James, Memoir of William Allen, F.R.S. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1851.

III. SECONDARY

A. Articles and Pamphlets:

Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Sciences.
vol. xxii. pp. 35-44. American Academy of Political and
Social Sciences. Philadelphia, 1903.

Baldwin, Simeon E., The International Congresses and Confer-
ences of the Last Century as Forces Working Toward Soli-
dation of the World. American Journal of International
Law. 1:565-578) New York, July 1907 and October 1907.
1:808-829)

Barrett, Ellen Strong, Elihu Burritt, the Learned Blacksmith,
New England Magazine, vol. 16, New Series, June 1897.

Caldwell, Robert Granville, The Peace Congresses of the Nine-
teenth Century, Delivered at Rice Institute in autumn of
1917. Rice Institute Pamphlet, vol. 5, April 1918.

Call, Arthur Deerin, The Will to End War, Washington. Re-
print from Advocate of Peace, April and May 1924.

Clarke, Hon. John H., America and World Peace, New York,
1925.

Darby, W. Evans, The New England Non-Resistance Society.
A History and a Rejoinder. London, 1915.

Darby, W. Evans, Origin of Peace Societies. Read at Uni-
versal Peace Congress in Chicago, 1893. London, 1893.

La Revue de Paris, Tome 6, December 1896, pp. 599-627.

Nys, Ernest, Codification of International Law, American
Journal of International Law, vol. 5, October 1911,
pp. 871-900.

Pollard, Prof. A. F., Essay on League of Nations in History.
In Collection of Essays, The League of Nations, edited
by Viscount Grey, London, 1919.

Sellac, M. Jarousse de, Periodical Peace Congresses. Amer-
ican Journal of International Law, vol. 5, 1911.

World Peace Foundation, Arbitration and the United States.
Vol. IX - 1926, Nos. 6-7.

B. Books:I. General:

Avenel, Henri, Histoire de la Presse Francaise, Paris,
1900.

- Baker, Sir Sherston, Halleck's International Law, 2 vols. Third Edition. Baker Editor, London, 1893.
- Beckwith, George C., The Book of Peace: A Collection of Essays on War and Peace. Boston, 1845.
- Beckwith, George C., The Peace Manual. Boston, 1868.
- Burritt, Elihu, Chips from Many Blocks. Toronto, 1878.
- Call, Arthur Deerin, Our Country and World Peace, Denver, 1926.
- Debidour, A., Historie Diplomatique de L'Europe. Paris, 1891.
- Fenwick, Charles G., International Law. New York, 1924.
- Flick, Alexander Clarence, Modern World History, New York, 1926.
- Gettell, Raymond G., History of Political Thought, New York, 1924.
- Hayes, C. H. J., Political and Social History of Modern Europe. 2 vols. Revised Edition, New York, 1925.
- Hershey, Amos S., The Essentials of International Public Law. New York, 1919.
- Hershey, Amos S., History of International Relations During Antiquity and the Middle Ages. American Journal of International Law, vol. 5, 1911.
- Hicks, Frederick Charles, The New World Order. Garden City, New York, 1920.
- Hirst, Margaret E., Quakers in Peace and War. New York, 1923.
- Kinglake, Alexander William, Invasion of the Crimea. 3 vols. Fourth Edition. New York, 1875.
- Lawrence, T. J., The Society of Nations. New York, 1919.
- Moore, John Bassett, American Diplomacy. New York, 1905.
- Moore, John Bassett, International Law Digest. 8 vols., Washington, Government Printing Office, 1906.
- Moore, John Bassett, History and Digest of the International Arbitrations to which the United States Has Been a Party. 6 vols., Washington, Government Printing Office, 1898.

Stanwood, Edward History of the Presidency.
2 vols. Boston and New York, 1899

250

Morrow, Dwight W., The Society of Free States, New York and London, 1919.

Mowat, R. B., A History of European Diplomacy, 1815-1914. London, 1923.

Oppenheim, L., International Law. 2 vols. New York, 1912.

Phelps, Edith M., A League of Nations. Third Edition. Revised and Enlarged. New York, 1919.

Phillips, Walter Alison, Confederation of Europe. Second Edition. London, 1920.

Piggott, Sir Francis, The Declaration of Paris of 1856. London, 1919.

Potonie-Pierre, Edmond, Historique du Mouvement Pacifique. Berne, 1889.

Potter, Pitman B., Introduction to Study of International Organization, New York, 1922.

Reinsch, Paul S., Public International Unions. Boston and London, 1911.

Sayre, Francis Bower, Experiments in International Administration, New York, 1919.

Scott, James Brown, Peace Through Justice, New York, 1917.

Trueblood, Benjamin F., The Federation of the World, Boston and New York, 1899.

Ward, Sir A. W. and Gooch, G. P., The Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy, 1783-1919. 3 vols. New York, 1922-23.

Webster, Hutton, Modern European History. Revised Edition, New York, 1925.

. Biographies:

Appleton, Lewis, Memoirs of Henry Richard, The Apostle of Peace. London, 1889.

Ashley, Evelyn, Life of Lord Palmerston, 2 vols. London, 1879.

Bulwer, Sir Henry Lytton, Life of Henry John Temple, Viscount Palmerston. London, 1874.

Evans, Howard, Sir Randal Cremer, His Life and Work. London, 1909.

Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond, The Life of Lord Granville.
2 vols. Third Edition, London, 1905.

Garrison Children, Life of William Lloyd Garrison.
4 vols. New York, 1885.

Hinton, R. J., English Radical Leaders, New York, 1875.

Miall, Charles S., Henry Richard, M. P. London, 1889.

Morley, John, Life of Richard Cobden, 2 vols. Eighth
Edition. London, 1903.

Northend, Charles, Life and Labors of Elihu Burritt.
New York, 1879.

Pierce, Edward L., Memoir and Letters of Charles Sumner.
2 vols. Boston, 1877.

Richard, Henry, Memoirs of Joseph Sturge. London, 1864.

Scott, Moorsfield, Charles Sumner. Boston, 1900.

_____, Life of William Allen, 2 vols. Phila-
delphia, Henry Longstreth, Publisher, 1847. (No author
given).

FOOTNOTES

Introduction:

1. Herald of Peace, October 1820, vol.II, 318-20. London.
London Peace Society.

Chapter I. Pioneer Organization and Expansion:

1. D.L.Dodge, War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ, Introduction by Edwin D. Mead, Boston, 1905, vii.
2. Ibid., xviii
3. Ibid., 123-168
4. Ibid., xix
5. Herald of Peace, January 1819, London, vol. I.
6. W. E. Darby, Origin of Peace Societies, a paper, London, 1893, 14 pages
7. Dodge, War Inconsistent, etc., Intro., p.xix
8. H. of P., Jan. 1819, vol. I.
9. H. of P., Jul.-Aug.-Sept., 1828, vol.IV, pt.II., 411-20.
10. Dodge, War Inconsistent, etc., Intro. xx
11. Ibid., 1-120
12. H. of P., Jul.-Aug.-Sept., 1828, vol.IV, pt.II, 411-20.
13. Dodge, War Inconsistent, etc., Intro. viii
14. A.D.Call, Our Country and World Peace, Denver, 1926, 20.
15. Dodge, War Inconsistent, etc., Intro. xx
16. Ibid, xxi
17. Darby, Origin of P. Soc., 14 p.
18. Dodge, War Inconsistent, etc., Intro. xxi
19. Noah Worcester, A Solemn Review of the Custom of War, Boston, 1904
20. H. of P., Jan. 1819, vol. I

21. H. of P., Sept. 1819, V.I, 237-8: In his reply of January 29, 1816, Jefferson stated that age had caused him to withdraw from public affairs, but he expressed hope that "your writings may have effect in lessening this greatest of human evils."
22. Worcester, Solemn Rev., 18
23. Ibid., 20
24. Ibid., 21
25. Ibid., 22
26. H. of P., Jan. 1819, vol.I.
27. H. of P., Jan. 1920, vol. II. 1-5
28. W.E.Channing, Discourses on War, Intro. by E. D. Meade, xv-xvii
29. H. of P., Feb. 1819, vol.I., 50-52.
30. H. of P., Jan. 1819, vol.I.
31. H. of P., Feb. 1819, vol.I., 50-52
32. H. of P., Feb. 1819, vol.I, 57
33. H. of P., Jan. 1819, Letter from N. Worcester to R. Marsden, Chm. of Comm. of London P. Soc.
34. Channing, Discourses, Intro., xvii, states that within four years the membership had increased to a thousand, but this is apparently an exaggeration.
35. H. of P., Jan. 1819, vol.I.
36. H. of P., Mar. 1820, Vil.II., 91-2
37. H. of P., Jul.-Aug.-Sept., 1828, vol.IV, pt.II, 411-20
38. H. of P., Mar. 1820, vol.II, 91-2
39. A.D.Call, The Will to End War, Washington, 1924, 9.
40. H. of P., Jan. 1819, vol.I
41. H. of P., Mar. 1820, vol.II, 91-2
42. H. of P., May 1819, vol.I, 156
43. H. of P., Jul.-Aug.-Sept., 1828, vol.IV, pt.II., 411-20

44. H. of P., Jan. 1820, vol.II, 1-5
45. H. of P., Mar. 1820, vol.II, 91-2
46. H. of P., May 1819, vol.I, 156
47. H. of P., Jul.-Aug.-Sept., 1828, vol.IV., pt.II, 411-20
48. H. of P., Jan. 1842, N.S., vol.III, 1-11
49. H. of P. Jul.-Aug. Sept., 1828, vol.IV, pt.II, 411-20
50. Darby, Origin of P. Soc., 14 pp.
51. J. B. Scott, Peace Through Justice, New York, 1917, 12
52. H. of P., Jul.-Aug.-Sept. 1828, vol.IV, pt.II, 411-20
53. E. Potonie-Pierre, Historique du Mouvement Pacifique, Berne, 1899, 6-8.
54. Dictionary of National Biography, New York, 1885-1912
55. Life of William Allen, Philadelphia, Henry Longstreth, 1847, vol.I, 143-53.
56. Ibid., 143.
57. H. of P., Jan. 1819, vol.I.
58. Ibid., vol.I.
59. Ibid., Jul.-Aug.-Sept., 1828, vol.VI, pt.II, 411-420
60. E. Potonié-Pierre, Hist. du Mou. Pac., 7.
61. G. C. Beckwith, Peace Manual, Boston, 1868; H. of P., Jul.-Aug.-Sept. 1828, vol.IV, pt.II, 411-20; J. B. Scott, Peace Through Justice, p.12.
62. H. of P., Jul.-Aug.-Sept., 1828, vol.IV. pt.II, 411-20
63. W. E. Darby, Origin of P. Soc., 14.; H. of P., Jan. 1819, vol.I.
64. H. of P., Jan. 1819, vol.I.
65. H. of P., Jan. 1819, vol. I.
66. M. E. Hirst, Quakers in War and Peace, New York, 1923, 243-7.
67. Ibid., 243-7.

68. H. of P., Jan. 1819, vol.I, 26.
69. Ibid. 23-24
70. Ibid., Jan. 1819, vol.I.
71. Ibid., Jan. 1819, vol.I.
72. Ibid., Mar. 1820, vol.II, 91-2
73. Ibid., II, 121.
74. Ibid., Apr. 1820, II, 153.
75. Ibid., Jul. 1820, II, 222-3
76. Ibid., June 1819, I.
77. Ibid., Jul.-Aug.-Sept. 1828, vol.IV, pt.II, 411-20.
78. Ibid., Jan. 1820, vol.II, 1-5.
79. Hirst, Quakers in War, etc., 243-7.
80. H. of P., Dec. 1820, II, 372-73.
81. Ibid., Jul.-Aug.-Sept. 1828, vol.IV, pt.II, 411-20.
82. Ibid., Aug. 1843, N.S. III, 363-408. Speech of Marquis de la Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, President of Society of Christian Morals at London Convention.
83. Potonié-Pierre, Historique, etc., 6-8.
84. H. of P., Jul. 1842, N.S. III, 124-127.
85. Ibid., Jul. 1843, N.S. III., 317.
86. Ibid., Jan 1842, N.S. III., 18-24.
87. Larousse's Grand Dictionnaire du XIX^e Siecle.
88. H. of P., Jul.-Aug.-Sept.¹⁸³², vol.IX, pt.I, N.S., 171-76.
89. Ibid., Jul.-Aug.-Sept. 1831, vol.VIII, pt.I, N.S.
- 88a.Ibid., Jan. 1819, I.
- 89a.Ibid., Jan. 1819, I.
90. Ibid., Jan. 1819,I.
91. Ibid., Feb. 1819, I, 57.

92. Call, Will to End War, 9.
93. Ibid., 12.
94. J. B. Scott, Peace Through Justice, 12-13.
95. H. of P., Oct. 1820, II, 318-20.
96. W. E. Darby, The New England Non-Resistance Society: A History and Rejoinder, London, 1912.
97. H. of P. Jan. 1820, II, 1-5.
98. Ibid., Mar. 1819, I. 68.
99. Ibid., Oct.-Nov.-Dec. 1831, VIII, pt.I, N.S., 205-6.
100. Ibid. IX, pt.I, Jul.-Aug.-Sept. 1833, 170-1.
101. Ibid. IX, pt.I, Oct.-Nov.-Dec. 236-7.
102. Ibid. Jan. 1842, N.S., III, 18-24; J.B.Scott, Peace Through Justice, 8-9.
103. H. of P., Jan. 1842, N.S., III, 18-24.
104. W. E. Darby, International Tribunals, London 1899, 223-27.
105. The plans of Henry IV, Cruce, Penn, St.Pierre, and Rousseau had given judicial functions to the Congress of Nations sitting as a court. Bentham's work of 1789 contained the Ladd idea, but it was not published until about 1840.
106. Henry Richard, Memoirs of Joseph Sturge, London, 1864, 350-53.
107. H. of P., Feb. 1819, I, 33-34.
108. Ibid., Jan. 1819, I.
109. Ibid., Apr.-May-June, 1835,X, pt.I, N.S., 65-75.
110. Ibid., Jul. 1839, I. N.S.
111. Potonié-Pierre, Historique, etc. 6-8.
112. H. of P., June, 1819, I, 178-9.
113. Ibid., Feb. 1820, 41.
114. Ibid., Apr.-May-June, 1823, II, 70-73.
115. Ibid., Jan. 1842, N.S. III, 18-24.

116. Ibid., Jan. 1819, I, 11.
117. Ibid., Jan. 1819, I, 12-13.
118. Ibid., Jan. 1842, N.S. III, 38-9.
- 118a. D. L. Dodge, War Inconsistent etc., ix.
119. W.E. Channing, Discourses etc., 77 ff.
120. Encyclopaedia Americana, New York, 1926.
121. Ibid.
122. Ibid.; J. B. Scott, Peace Through Justice, 8-16; H. of P., Apr. 1839, N.S., I, 260 ff.; H. of P., Jan. 1842, N.S., III, 1-11; Life of William Lloyd Garrison told by his Children, New York, vol. II, 229, 1885 (foot-note); I, 113; John Hemmenway, William Ladd, the Apostle of Peace, St. Anthony's Park, Minn. 1891.
123. H. of P., Jan. 1842, N.S. III, 121.
124. Dictionary of National Biography. New York, 1885-1912.
125. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Cambridge, 1910; D.N.B.
126. New International Encyclopaedia, New York, 1915.

Chapter II. Character, Leadership and Origin of Peace Congresses.

1. D. N. B.; Richard's Joseph Sturge; Hirst's Quakers in Peace and War, 254-60; C. Northend, Life and Labours of Elihu Burritt, New York, 1879, 422-26.
2. Richard's Joseph Sturge, 428-30.
3. D. N. B.; C. Miall, Henry Richard, M.P., London, 1889, 29-32; L. Appleton, Memoirs of Henry Richard, the Apostle of Peace, London, 1-3; H. Evans, Sir Randal Cremer, His Life and Work.
4. R. J. Hinton, English Radical Leaders, New York, 1875; 241-51.
5. Northend's Burritt; Encyclopaedia Americana.
6. Northend's Burritt, 449-50.

7. Hirst, Quakers in Peace etc., 273-303.
8. J. Bright, and J.E.T.Rogers, Speeches by Richard Cobden,
M.P. London 1903, 509-19.
9. J. Morely, Life of Richard Cobden, London 1903, I, 230-31.
10. J. Bright and J.E.T. Rogers, Speeches of Cobden, 399-404;
405-14.
11. Ibid., 389-98.
12. H. of P., June 1849, VI, N.S., 332-3.
13. L. Appleton, Memoirs of Henry Richard, the Apostle of Peace. London 1889. 86.
14. E.L.Pierce, Memoir and Letters of Charles Sumner, 2 vols.
Boston, 1877, II, 339.
15. Ibid., II, 343.
16. Ibid., II, 344-84.
17. C. Sumner, Addresses on War. Intro. by E.D.Mead Boston, 1902
18. World Peace Foundation Pamphlet, Arbitration and the United States, IX, nos. 6-7, 1926, 494.
19. Sumner, Addresses on War, Intro. by Mead, xxv.
20. Encyclopaedia Americana.
21. Larousse, Dictionnaire du XIX^e Siecle, Paris, 1876.
22. P.B.Potter, Introduction to Study of International Organization. New York, 1922. ch.18, p.291.
23. Richard's Sturge, 224-25.
24. Ibid., 229-49.
25. Ibid., 350-53. Reprint of Minutes of Meeting.
26. H. of P., Oct. 1841, N.S. II, 404.
27. H. of P., Jul. 1842, N.S. III, 113-119.
28. H. of P., Apr. 1843, N.S.III, 305-6.
29. Ibid., Apr. 1843, N.S. III, 303-4
30. Richard's Sturge, 350-53.

31. H. of P., Jul. 1843, N.S. III, 352-55.

Chapter III. THE PEACE CONGRESSES.

1. H. of P., Aug. 1843, N.S. III, 363-408.
2. Ibid., Oct, 1843, III, 451-62.
3. Ibid., Oct. 1843, N.S. 462-464.
4. Northend's Burritt, 23-26.
5. Sumner, Addresses on War, 212-14.
6. Northend's Burritt, 82-92.
7. Ibid., 422-26.
8. Appleton's Richard, 3-5.
9. H. of P., Oct. 1848, N.S. VI, 145-146
10. Ibid., Oct. 1848, N.S., VI, 145-191.
11. Northend's Burritt, 52-61.
12. LeMoniteur Universel, Paris, Sept.23,24,25, 1848.
13. H. of P., Nov. 1848, VI, N.S., 192-5; 201.
14. C.S.Miall, Henry Richard, M.P., London, 1889. 34-35.
15. Ibid., 36-51.
16. H. of P., Dec. 1848, VI, N.S., 213-14.
17. Ibid., Dec. 1848, VI., N.S., 213-222.
18. Ibid., Feb. 1849, VI, N.S., 252-3.
19. Ibid., Mar. 1849, VI, N.S., 267.
20. Ibid., Apr. 1846, VI, N.S., 269-81.
21. Miall's Richard, 36-51.
22. Potonié-Pierre, Historique, etc., 11.
23. H. of P., Aug. 1849, N.S. VI., 339-345.
24. Ibid., June 1849, VI., N.S., 318.

25. Ibid., Jul. 1849, VI, N.S., 336-7.
26. H. of P., Aug. 1849, VI, N.S., 344-45.
27. Morley's Cobden, II, 46-8.
28. H. of P., Sept. 1849, VI, N.S.; London Peace Society, Reports of the Peace Congresses at Brussels, Paris, Frankfort, London, Manchester, and Edinburgh, in the years 1848, 1849, 1850, 1851, and 1853. London, 1861.
29. E. Nys, Codification of International Law, American Journal of International Law, v.5, Oct. 1911, 871-900.
30. Reports of the Peace Congresses, 1848-53. London 1861, 56-64.
31. Ibid., 67-74.
32. Miall's Richard, 52-57.
33. Morley's Cobden, II., 49, Letter to Mrs. Cobden, August 28, 1849.
34. Le Moniteur Universel, August 23, 25, 26, 1849.
35. Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, Nov. 1849, vol.66, 581-606.
36. Quarterly Review, Oct. 1849. Article on Peace Agitators.
37. Miall's Richard, 58-59.
38. H. of P., Jul. 1850, I., N.S., 8-9.
39. Miall's Richard, 59-65.
40. Appleton's Richard, 2-14.
41. H. of P., Sept. 1850, I., N.S., 25-36.
42. Morley's Cobden, II, 81-83. Letter to Mrs. Cobden, Aug. 23, 1850.
43. H. of P., Oct. 1850, I, N.S., 41-42.
44. Ibid., Apr. 1851, I, N.S., 110-112.
45. A very strict law concerning meetings, which was a part of the reaction in Prussia following the Revolution of 1848. The decade following the Revolution was one of the most arbitrary periods in the history of Prussian Government.

46. H. of P. Jul. 1851, I, N.S., 152-53.
47. Ibid., Jul. 1851, I. N.S., 152-3.
48. Ibid., Sept. 1851, I. N.S., 192-94.
49. Reports of the Peace Congresses, London, 1851, viii-ix.
50. Appleton's Richard, 15-16.
51. Reports of Peace Congresses, London 1851, x.
52. Hinton, Eng. Rad. Leaders, 244.
53. Note Bouvet's activity at and following the Paris Congress.
54. H. of P., Sept. 1851, I. N.S., 185-90.

Chapter IV. Failures and Achievements.

1. G. C. Beckwith, Book of Peace, Boston, 1845.
2. World Peace Foundation Pamphlet, Arbit. and U.S., IX, nos. 6-7. 1926, p.485.
3. H.of.P. 1853, II, N.S., 239-40.
4. House Reports 979, 25th Cong., 2nd Sess.
5. House Reports 194, 25th Cong., 3rd Sess.
6. House Reports 671, 29th Cong. 1st Sess.
7. Congressional Globe, 30th Cong., 2nd Sess., p. 267.
8. Journal of House of Representatives, Feb. 5, 1849.
9. H. of P., Apr. 1849, VI. N.S., pp.281-2.
10. Reports of the Peace Congresses, etc., Speech of Beckwith at London Congress, 1851.
11. Congressional Globe, 23, p. 437.
12. Senate Reports, 270, 31st Cong., 2nd Sess.
13. Cong. Globe, 26, p. 761.
14. Senate Docts., vol. 24, no. 231, pt.6, 56th Cong., 2nd Sess. pp. 107, 108, 114-116.

15. World P. Found. Pamphlet, Arbit. and U.S., IX, 1926, nos. 6-7, 479-86.
16. W.E.Darby, International Tribunals, 486 ff.
17. Darby in his work International Tribunals, states that this is the first arbitral agreement of the kind recorded between independent nations, but according to the World Peace Foundation Pamphlet, Arbitration and the United States, p. 587, two such general arbitral agreements had preceded this one; Colombia-Peru, 1829, and Colombia-Venezuela, 1842.
18. W. M. Mallory, Treaties, Conventions, International Acts, Protocols and Agreements, between the United States and Other Powers. 1776-1909. Washington, 1910. I, 1117.
19. Senate Executive Documents, 52, 60, p.338, 30th Cong. 1st Sess.
20. For this information concerning the attitude of the American Peace Society toward the War with Mexico, I am indebted to Mrs. Mable W. Call, who examined the files of the Advocate of Peace through the years 1846-9, and in a letter of April 29, 1927, reported her findings bearing on this point.
21. Richard's Sturge, 430-31.
22. Ashley's Palmerston, II, 59-60.
23. H. of P. June 1853, p.227. Extract from Annual Report of London Peace Society.
24. H. of P. June 1853, II, N.S., 233-34.
25. Mallory, Treaties, Conventions, etc., I, 665.
26. H. of P., Oct. 1853, II, N.S., 281-82.
27. Mallory, Treaties, Conventions, etc. I, 669.
28. Edward Stanwood, History of the Presidency, Boston and New York, 1898, I, 256.
29. E.L.Pierce, Memoir and Letters of Charles Sumner, Boston, 1877, II, 376.
30. Bright and Rogers, Speeches of Cobden, 389-98.
31. H. of P. Apr. 1849, VI. N.S., 277.

32. Ibid., May 1849, VI, N.S., 297; Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, civ, p.758.
33. Miall's Richard, 36-51.
34. According to speech made by M. Visschers at Paris Congress in 1849, H. of P., Sept. 1849. VI, N.S.
35. Northend's Burritt, 62-74. Excerpts from Burritt's Journal.
36. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, cvi, 1849, 5th vol. of Session, 54-122.
37. H. of P., June 1849, VI, N.S., 332-333.
38. Hansard's Parl. Deb., cix, 2nd vol. of Sess. 1850, 758-67.
39. Morley's Cobden, II, 77. Letter of Jul. 5, 1850.
40. Bright and Rogers, Speeches of Cobden, 399-404.
41. Ibid., 405-414.
42. Sumner's Addresses on War, 218-19.
43. H. of P., Mar. 1849, VI, N.S., 265-66.
44. H. of P., Aug. 1849, VI, N.S., 341. Letter of July 1849 to Richard and Sturge.
45. Richard's Sturge, 434-55.
46. H. of P., Oct. 1850, I, N.S., 43-45.
47. H. of P., Nov. 1850, I, N.S., 49-52.
48. Ploetz' Manual of Universal History, Boston, 1925, 498-9.
49. Annual Register, 1850, London, 1851, 298-306.
50. Sir. F. Piggott, The Declaration of Paris, London, 1919, 115-33.
51. H. of P., Apr. 1856, III, N.S., 38-39.
52. Miall's Richard, 105-110.
53. H. of P., May 1856, III, N.S., 57.
54. Lord E. Fitzmaurice, Life of Lord Granville, I, 144.

55. Sir Maxwell, Life and Letters of the Fourth Earl of Clarendon, II, 118-119.
56. Piggott's Declaration of Paris, 341-42. H. of P., June 1856, N.S., III, 60-66.
57. J. B. Moore, International Law Digest, 8 vols. Washington, 1906, vol. VII, p.2.
58. J. B. Moore, Article, Arbitration and Mediation, Annals of Amer. Academy of Pol. and Soc. Sci., 1903, XXII, 35-44.
59. Piggott's Declaration of Paris, 387.
60. Richard's Sturge, 496-502.
61. H. of P., June 1856, N.S., Vol. III, 61 ff.
62. J. B. Scott, Supervisor, Proceedings of the Hague Peace Conferences. Conference of 1899. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York, 1920. Part IV, Annex 1C, 804-8.
63. R. B. Mowat, History of European Diplomacy, 1815.-1914. London, 1923.
64. Sir S. Baker, Halleck's International Law, Third Edition, London, 1893, I, 466-7.

Chapter V. Rise and Triumph of the War Spirit.

1. H. of P. Sept. 1849, Speech by M. Visschers at Paris Congress, 1849.
2. Morley's Cobden, II, 11.
3. G. P. Gooch, Later Correspondence of Lord John Russell, 2 vols., London, 1925, 236-70.
4. H. of P., Feb. 1848, VI, N.S., 18.
5. Gooch, Corr. of Lord John Russell, I, 294.
6. Morley's Cobden, II, 72-75.
7. Gooch, Corr. of Lord John Russell, I, 236-70.

8. E. Ashley, Life of Lord Palmerston, 2 vols. London, 1879. II, 175-7.
9. Ibid., II, 212 ff.
10. Appleton's Richard, Militia Bill of 1852.
11. H. of P., June 1852, N.S., II, 65.
12. Morley's Cobden, II, 113-15.
13. Ibid., 115.
14. Ibid., 120.
15. H. of P., Aug. 1852, II, N.S., 86-7.
16. Ibid., Oct. 1852, II, N.S., 114-17.
17. Ibid., Nov. 1852, II, N.S., 123.
18. Miall's Richard, 87-91
19. H. of P., Mar. 1853, N.S., II, 194-96.
20. Morley's Cobden, II, 134-40.
21. H. of P., Jan. 1853, II, N.S., 145.
22. Morley's Cobden, II, 120.
23. Appleton's Richard, 18.
24. H. of P., Feb. 1853, N.S., II, 157-176.
25. Miall's Richard, 91-94.
26. Bright and Rogers, Speeches of Cobden, 520-9.
27. Northend's Burritt, 142.
28. H. of P., Mar. 1853, II, N.S., 196-7.
29. Reports of Peace Congresses, 1848-53. Edinburgh Conference, Oct. 12-13, 1853.
30. Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, Mar. 1853, vol. 73, pp. 364-78.
31. Richard's Sturge, 455-462.
32. Morley's Cobden, II, 144-45.

33. H. of P., Dec. 1853, II, N.S., 306.
34. Hirst, Quakers in Peace, etc., 534-5.
35. H. of P., June 1854, III, N.S., 62-66.
36. A. W. Kinglake, Invasion of the Crimea, 3.vols. Fourth Edition, New York, 1875. I, 262-272.
37. Morley's Cobden, II, 176-177.
38. H. of P., May 1855, III, N.S., 203.
39. Ibid., June 1855, III, N.S., 209-12; June 1856, III, N.S., 62-66. Annual Reports of London Peace Society of 1855 and 1856.
40. Appleton's Richard, 19-25.
41. Richard's Sturge, 462-87; Hirst, Quakers in Peace, etc., 534-5.
42. H. of P., Jan. 1855, III, N.S., 155.
43. Morley's Cobden, II, 173.
44. Richard's Sturge, 519-22.
45. Miall's Richard, 112-118.
46. Morley's Cobden, II, 385.
47. H. of P., Jul. 1854, III, N.S., 80-1.
48. Ibid., May 1855, III, N.S., 200-2.
49. Ibid., Jan. 1858, V., N.S., 6-7.
50. Ibid., Oct. 1858, V., N.S., 114-15.
51. Morley's Cobden, 237-69.
52. American Peace Society, Advocate of Peace, Boston, August 1860, 93.
53. Ibid., Mar. 1861, 197-9; Mar. 1861, 199-202.
54. Ibid., Aug. 1861, 287-290.
55. Ibid., Jul. 1861, 262.
56. H. of P., Jan. 1860, VI, N.S., 1-2.
57. Ibid., June 1860, VI, N.S., 61-66.

58. Ibid., May 1863, VII, N.S., 211.

Chapter VI. Summery and Conclusions.

1. See page 244.
1. Advocate of Peace, Jan. 1927, Vol.89, no. 1, 1-2.
2. H. Evans, Sir Randal Cremer, His Life and Work, London, 1909, 24.
3. Evan's Cremer, 70-73; Northend's Burritt, 449-50.
4. Potonie-Pierre, Historique, etc., 82-93.
5. Krehbiel, Nationalism, War and Society, New York, 1916. 150, 166.
6. Krehbiel, p.159, states that in 1910 there were about 160 peace societies, with many branches.
7. W. E. Darby, Orig. of P. Socys., 14 pages.